The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXXIII, No. 1 JULY, 1950

CONTENTS

Index to Catholic Pamphlets in the English Language: December 1948—March 10, 1950 . *Eugene P. Willging* 1

A Pause for Thanks . . . . . *Daniel A. Lord, S. J.* 23

The Problem of Our Lady's Coredemption *J. B. Carol, O.F.M.* 32

The Good Shepherd in Parable and Prophecy *Thomas A. Halley, S.J.* 52

The Religious Assent due to the Teachings of Papal Encyclicals . . . . . *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 59

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Order of Solemn Exposition and Holy Communion . . . 68

Holy Communion on Holy Saturday 68

Kneeling during a Requiem Mass 69

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1950, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Holding the Book at the Absolution 70

Holy Communion at Midnight 70

Parish Dances 72

ANALECTA 73

BOOK REVIEWS

The Cardinal, *by Henry Morton Robinson* 77

The Cardinal's Story, *by Stephen K. Swift* 80

NEW HERDER BOOK

Pattern Divine

Our Lord's Hidden Life

BY

PATRICK J. TEMPLE, S.T.D.

$5.00

Pattern Divine is a comprehensive study of the life of Christ up to the beginning of the public ministry. All available and reliable sources have been utilized by the author to amplify the meager account in the Gospel narratives, especially for the period of the hidden life at Nazareth.

No one could desire a better commendation of the quality of the work than the following words of Father Vosté, Secretary of the Pontificial Biblical Commission. He says that Doctor Temple's work "is exegetical and historical, theological and ascetical." "It is a standard work, a monument in honor of the hidden life of our Lord. . . . I recommend it therefore to theologians and exegetes and as well to all those souls who desire to make their life conform more and more to our divine Model.

Besides its critical and scholarly quality, *Pattern Divine* has a warmth of piety that reflects the habitual attitude of the author, who has made the subject his life's study.

A Selection of the Spiritual Book Associates

From your bookstore or from the

B. HERDER BOOK CO.

15 & 17 South Broadway • St. Louis 2, Mo.

INDEX TO CATHOLIC PAMPHLETS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE DECEMBER 1948 — MARCH 10, 1950

This informal supplement to *The Index to Catholic Pamphlets*[1] is offered as an experiment and is intended primarily to benefit pastors and pamphlet-rack tenders who have occasionally expressed the desire to procure data on new titles more frequently than through the publication of a biennial or triennial volume. Space limitations will not permit the inclusion of the subject-author-title-series index that has been given in the past; it is the intent to furnish this with a forthcoming reprint of the classified, annotated list given below.

During the fifteen months that have elapsed since the appearance of the June, 1946—Nov., 1948 volume of *The Index to Catholic Pamphlets,* production has continued at a steady pace, though not nearly as extensive in new titles as one might have anticipated. Increased costs of printing, coupled with an approach of the saturation point in some subject areas, may account for a plateau in production. While distribution facilities have increased notably in the past ten years, the annual sales volume of approximately 13,000,000 copies is a clear indication that many Catholics are not using this form of literature. It is of further significance that no new firm of major status has entered the field in the past few years. Nor have

[1] The Index to American Catholic Pamphlets: An annotated classified list of 1,500 American Catholic pamphlets in print, January 1, 1937. 128p.

The Index to American Catholic Pamphlets, Volume Two, 1942. An annotated classified list of 1,233 American Catholic Pamphlets published from January, 1937 to July, 1942. 96p.

The Index to American Catholic Pamphlets, Volume Three, 1946. An annotated classified list of 730 American Catholic pamphlets published from August, 1942 to May, 1946. 107p.

The Index to Catholic Pamphlets in the English Language, 1949. An annotated classified list of 847 Catholic pamphlets in the English language, June, 1946 to November, 1948. 960p.

(Eugene P. Willging is the compiler of this series. Volume 1 is out of print; Volumes 2-4 are available from Catholic University of America Press.)

any new subject areas been widely developed; true, there are occasional titles on Federal Aid or "mercy-murder" but these do not add appreciably to total output. The distribution of publication dates of the 213 titles included in this supplement shows this pattern:

1950:	12
1949:	116
1948:	39
1947:	5
1946:	6
1945:	1
1944:	4
1943:	5
Others:	25
Total:	213

Thus, it seems clear that the annual product of American, English and Irish presses today would be somewhat around 125-150 titles, making an allowance for those that may not have come in for annotation.

Despite the paucity of new titles, the standard of writing and of typography has been uniformly high. In fact, some of these 1949 entries rank with the best of printed books where the incentive to surpass is aided by the profit motive and reviewers' remarks.

In the listing below, the same subject classification employed in the earlier *Indexes* has been utilized. All subjects were divided into fifteen main areas, with a sixteenth allotted to Juvenile Pamphlets. These main classes have been divided into 206 parts, designated by Arabic numerals, e.g., *7. Christianity and Culture.* As explained in the Introduction to Volume Three of *The Index* . . . these numbers supply a means whereby anyone may maintain a permanent subject file of past and current titles.[2]

Thanks are rendered to the publishers who have sent in review copies, either directly to the compiler or to the *Review.*

[2] "A Personal Pamphlet File," Index to American Catholic Pamphlets, III (1946), vii-xii.

Directory of Publishers

Note: Only publishers of two or more titles, included in this article, are given here. Addresses of publishers of a single title are given with the main entry. For a more complete list of names, see v. 4, pp. xxii-xxiii.

Abbreviations Used	*Full Name and Address*
America	America Press, Grand Central Terminal Bldg., Room 1054, 70 E. 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.
American Ecclesiastical Review	American Ecclesiastical Review, Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.
B.C.P.A.	Benedictine Convent of Perpetual Adoration, Clyde, Mo.
Bruce	Bruce Publishing Co., 400 N. Broadway, Milwaukee 1, Wis.
Catechetical	Catechetical Guild, 147 E. Fifth St., St. Paul 1, Minn.
C.I.S.	Catholic Information Society, 214 W. 31st St., New York 1, N. Y.
C.S.M.C.	Catholic Students Mission Crusade, Crusade Castle, Shattuc Ave., Cincinnati 25, Ohio
C.T.S.I.	Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, 7 & 8 Lower Abbey St., Dublin, Ireland
C.T.S. (L)	Catholic Truth Society, 38-40 Eccleston Square, London, S.W. 1.
C.C.D.	Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, 1312 Mass. Ave., N.W., Washington 5, D. C. (N.B. Bulk Orders should go to St. Anthony Guild.)
Grail	The Grail, St. Meinrad, Indiana
Hennessy	David Hennessy, Distributist Bookstall, Stotlers Cross Roads, W. Va.
Holy Name	Holy Name Society, Lexington Ave. at 65th St., New York 21, N. Y.
Irish Messenger	Irish Messenger Office, 5 Gt. Denmark, Dublin, Ireland
N.C.W.C.	National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington 5, D. C.
Newman	Newman Press, Westminster, Md.

O.S.V.	Our Sunday Visitor, Huntington, Ind.
Outline	Outline Press, Inc., 2438 Flournoy St., Chicago 12, Ill.
Paulist	Paulist Press, 401 W. 59th St., New York 19, N. Y.
Queen's Work	Queen's Work, 3515 S. Grand Blvd., St. Louis 18, Mo.
Radio Replies	Radio Replies Press, Rumble and Carty, 500 Robert St., St. Paul 1, Minn.
Rumble and Carty	Fathers Rumble and Carty, 500 Robert St., St. Paul 1, Minn.
St. Anthony Guild	St. Anthony Guild Press, Franciscan Monastery, Paterson, N. J.

Classified, Annotated List of Pamphlets

II. Religion and Christianity

7. Christianity and Culture

GILL, ERIC. Unholy Trinity. Pictures by Denis Tegetmeier. London, Dent (Agent: David Hennessy), 1938.

A satire in essay and illustration on the modern unholy trinity of power, respectability, and money. Contents: Unholy trinity. Unholy alliance. Work and leisure. Paradox of plenty. Wheels within wheels. Yes, we have no bananas. Europa and the bull. Swine. Cannon fodder. Safe for Christianity. Melancholia.

7.1 Religion and Science

SCIENCE in the Modern World. College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn., 1948. 59p.

A symposium in which the participants were Hugh Stott Taylor (Chemistry), H. Marston Morse (Mathematics), James Franck (Chemistry), Samuel K. Allison (Physics), J. W. J. Carpender (Biology), and the Very Rev. John L. Callahan, O.P. (Philosophy).

III. Bible

11. General Works

REMLER, FRANCIS J., C.M. Can the Bible Be the Only Rule of Faith? St. Anthony Guild, 1948. 34p. 5c.

The importance of oral teaching in handing down Christian thought and traditions and the place of the Church in that process of transmittal.

IV. Catholic Church. General Works. Church History.

16. Annuals

THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC ALMANAC, 1950. Compiled by the Clerics of Holy Name College, Washington 17, D. C. St. Anthony Guild, 1950. 832p. Paper, $1.50; Cloth, $2.00.

Many sections of this indispensable annual have been reset in a more legible bold-face type. Several new features, such as important anniversaries occurring in 1950, have been added.

17. General Works on Organization, Attributes, etc.

LEO XIII, POPE. *Satis cognitum.* The Unity of the Church. Encyclical Letter. With Discussion Club Outline by Rev. Gerald C. Treacy, S.J. Paulist, 1949. 48p.

18. Eastern Catholic Churches

MCMAHON, THOMAS. "Salvete Florem Martyrum." Byzantine Catholics: Their History and Liturgy. Catholic Near East Welfare Assn., 480 Lexington Ave., New York City 17, 1948. 16p. Gratis.

SHEREGHY, BASIL. The Greek-Catholic Church. Pittsburgh Byzantine-Slavonic Diocese Publications Committee, St. Procopius Seminary, Lisle, Ill., 1948. 48p. 25c.

Account of the founding, organization, and place of the Church in theology and history. Primarily addressed to Greek Catholics although also of interest to others.

SHEREGHY, BASIL. What Are Greek-Catholics? Byzantine-Slavonic Publications Committee, St. Procopius Seminary, Lisle, Ill., 1948. 48p. 25c.

Contents: The rite. The Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. The spirit of the Oriental Church. Change of rites. Our rite and Holy Scripture. The language of our liturgy. Church vestments and their color in the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. Church books of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. The historical mission of Catholics of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite.

20. Catholic Action

DONNELLY, FRANCIS BERNARD. What Is This Catholic Action? The Papal Program Explained. America, 1949. 46p. 25c.

Contents: Secularism: segregation of religion from life. A program of integration. Integration through the parish. A program, not a slogan. A program of apostolic training. A program of total mobilization. Conclusion. Appendices: Statement of the American hierarchy, Nov. 16, 1948, upon the problem of secularism. Official pronouncements of Pope Pius XI and Pope Pius XII.

21. Societies

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY (London). The C.T.S. and Its Work. Author, 1949. 22p. Gratis.

History, organization and types of membership.

JEWELL, WALTER. The C. E. G. and You. Catholic Truth Society (London), 1948. 20p. 3d.

An explanation of the work of the Catholic Evidence Guild.

NOLL, JOHN FRANCIS, Bp. of Fort Wayne. How to Counteract anti-Catholic Propaganda. Our Sunday Visitor, 1949. 16p.

The editor of *Our Sunday Visitor* proposes a Department of Information to answer false accusations against the Church.

O'CONNELL, VINCENT J., S.M. Ten years of the Catholic Committee of the South. C. C. of the South, 2901 S. Carrollton Ave., New Orleans 18, La., 1949. 16p.

Historical sketch.

23. Church History. General Works.

THE TIMES (London). Catholicism Today. Letters to the Editor Reprinted from *The Times*, with a Special Article and a Leading Article. London, Times Publishing Co., (U.S. Agent: David Hennessy), 1949. 58p. 20c.

Forty-six significant letters sent in response to a lead article of Oct. 31, 1949.

25. Church History—Europe

TISSERANT, EUGENE, Cardinal. The Iron Curtain Pastoral. St. Anthony Guild, 1949. 32p. 10c.

A survey of "the religious character of the persecution which members of the hierarchy, especially those belonging to the Eastern Rite —are undergoing behind the 'Iron Curtain,' and a plea, at the beginning of Lent, for the renewal of Christian life."

26. Church History—North America

MCSHANE, JOHN F. The Hand of Providence. Brigittine Press, 801 N.

West St., Indianapolis 2, Ind., 1949. 26p. 25c.

"A tribute to the Civil War nurses of the Sisters of Providence, St. Mary-of-the-Woods, Ind., whose five years of patriotic service in the foundation of Indianapolis General Hospital has almost been forgotten."

30. Parishes. Parochial Clergy.

HAGSPIEL, BRUNO M., S.V.D. Optimism and the Parish Priest. Mission Press, 1949. 19p.

An exhortation.

V. DOCTRINE

35. General Works. Catechisms for Adults.

CONFRATERNITY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. A Catechism of Christian Doctrine. Revised Edition of the Baltimore Catechism. A Text for Secondary Schools and Colleges. No. 3. St. Anthony Guild, 1949. 426p. $1.00.

A complete revision, with Scriptural quotations accompanying the answers. Contents: Indulgences. Prayers. Part One: The Creed. Part Two: The Commandments. Part Three: The Sacraments and Prayer. Appendices: Why I am a Catholic. *Acerbo nimis* of Pius X, establishing the Confraternity. *Provido sane consilio* of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, Jan. 12, 1935, relative to catechetical instruction. Prayers to be recited after the celebration of Low Mass. Alphabetical index.

MCSORLEY, JOSEPH, C.S.P. To a Busy Man (Three Letters). Paulist, 1949. 24p.

A discussion of religion and of the Catholic Church.

41. Life of Christ

BIBLE. NEW TESTAMENT. Christ in the Gospel. The Life of Christ by the Four Evangelists. With 170 Original Illustrations. Confraternity of the Precious Blood, 1949. x, 438p.

Edited by the Rev. Joseph B. Frey. A gospel reading, accompanied by a picture, for each day of the year. Readings are in a six month cycle. Illustrations by Ariel Agemian. A "Study Guide and Daily Practice" by the Rev. John A. O'Brien applies the lessons of the text.

44. Christology. Miscellaneous.

COATS, STUART, Sir. The Foretelling of Christ. With a Foreword by the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Charles L. H. Duchemin. Catholic Truth Society (London), 1948. 32p. 3d.

A collection of the chief biblical predictions of Christianity intended to add to the understanding and enjoyment of the Christian way of life.

47. Blessed Virgin Mary. Doctrinal Titles.

DEVINE, C. F., C.SS.R. Did Mary Have Other Children? League of St. Gerard, St. Alphonsus Seminary, Woodstock, Ontario, 1949. 32p. 10c.

Analysis of the expression "brethren of the Lord" to show that it means relatives of Christ.

48. Blessed Virgin Mary. Devotional Titles.

MARY CALLS. Our Lady Must Have Her Way! Pious Society of St. Paul, St. Paul Monastery, Canfield, Ohio, 1948. 8p. 5c.

An appeal for increased devotion to the Blessed Virgin, based largely on modern messages from her.

SMITH, BILL. A Layman Meets Our Lady. Queen's Work, 1949. 28p. 10c.

An introduction to devotion to Mary.

Our Lady of Fatima

CACELLA, JOSEPH. Fatima and the Rosary. St. Anthony's Welfare Center, 443 E. 125th St., P. O. Box 32, New York 54, N. Y. (n.d.). 32 (8), p.

A brief history of the wonders of Fatima, accompanied by prayers and exercises.

MARTIN, VINCENT M., O.P. Novena to Our Lady of Fatima. Holy Name Society, 141 E. 65th St., New York 21, N. Y. (n.d.). 16p.

Subtitle: Rosaries for Russia. Advocates a crusade of prayer for the conversion of Communistic Russia. A novena pamphlet arranged for congregational use.

MARYKNOLL SISTERS NOVITIATE. The Message of Fatima . . . Maryknoll Bookshelf, Maryknoll, N. Y., 1948. 103p.

A unit of work for intermediate grades correlating the story of Fatima with other subjects of the curriculum, and the play, "The Message of Fatima."

SHARKEY, DON. Mary's Message. Our Lady's Call to Prayer and Sacrifice. With an Introduction by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Leon A. McNeill. Catholic Action Bookshop, Wichita 2, Kan., 1949. 56p.

"A review of apparitions of our Lady in modern times, with special attention to the extraordinary events which took place at Fatima, Portugal, in the year 1917. Mr. Sharkey emphasizes Mary's call to prayer and penance, and brings out the urgent importance of our heeding her message." Introd.

Immaculate Heart of Mary

HEART of Our Mother and Queen. Benedictine Convent of Perpetual Adoration, 1948. 64p. 10c.

Contents: Why we should venerate the Heart of Mary. Symbols surrounding the image of Mary's Heart. The mother of beautiful love. Through the Heart of Mary to the Heart of Jesus. Fatima and the Immaculate Heart. Mass of the Immaculate Heart of Mary. Prayers.

PERPETUAL Novena to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, Our Lady of Fatima, Queen of the Most Holy Rosary. The Grail, 1948. 34p. 15c.

A history of the apparitions, the brief of Cardinal Salotti on the Feast of the Immaculate Heart, and novena devotions.

ROSCHINI, GABRIEL, O.S.M. Consecration to Mary Immaculate. Trans. by Father Marian, S.S.P. Apostolate of the Press, St. Paul's Monastery, Canfield, Ohio, 1949. 16p. 10c.

The purpose is to explain the nature of the consecration of the human race to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, the method of living and of spreading the practice.

Our Lady of Guadalupe

CISTERCIANS of the Strict Observance (Trappists). Our Lady of Guadalupe, the Hope of America. Trappist Monastery of Our Lady of Guadalupe, Valley Ranch, New Mexico, 1949. 36p. $1.00.

A history of the original apparitions and of the subsequent history of Our Lady of Guadalupe to whom the New Mexican monastery is dedicated. Excellent illustrations accompany an unusually well-printed text.

Our Lady of Knock

MCSHANE, JOHN F. Our Lady of Knock. A Once Unheard of Irish Village Startles the World. Brigittine Press, 801 N. West St., Indianapolis 2, Ind., 1948. 31p. 25c.

An account of the apparition of the Blessed Virgin at Knock, County Mayo, Ireland, in 1879, and of the cures from then to the present.

49. Rosary

MARTIN, VINCENT M., O.P. Rosaries for Russia. Holy Name Society, 1949.

An explanation of the nationwide movement sponsored by the Rosary Confraternity and the Holy Name Society for the conversion of Russia.

PARNELL, MARY TERESA. Outline Meditations on the Rosary. Catholic Truth Society (London), 1948. 24p. 3d.

QUINLAN, PATRICK T. Readings for the Recitation of the Rosary. St. Anthony Guild, 1949. 32p. 25c.

Gospel readings accompany illustrations for each mystery.

VI. LITURGICAL YEAR

64. General Works. Liturgical Calendars.

The MASS Year. A Daily Mass Guide for 1950. Grail, 1949. 123p. 30c.

Liturgical reflections on some of the Offertory chants, by Placidus Kempf, O.S.B. The Ordo follows the arrangement of the Roman and St. Andrew Daily Missals.

The MASS Year. A Daily Mass Guide for 1949. Grail, 1948. 124p. 30c.
Liturgical reflections on some of the Secrets, by Placidus Kempf, O.S.B. Arrangement as in the 1950 guide.

PILKINGTON, RONALD. The Holy Year of Jubilee, 1950. Catholic Truth Society (London), 1949. 15p. 3d.
Brief history of jubilee years, instructions for gaining the indulgence, and an account of the ceremonies of the opening.

SHEREGHY, BASIL. Your Liturgical Year (Greek-Catholic). Pittsburgh Byzantine Diocesan Press, Lisle, Ill., 1949. 48p. 25c.
"A short account of the feasts and fasts in the Greek-Catholic Church."

67. Christmas

LORD, DANIEL A., S.J. I'm Praying for My White Christmas. Queen's Work, 1949. 24p. 10c.
A Christmas message, with envelope, built around the keynote of whiteness.

70. Jesus Christ—Passion and Death

ALPHONSUS, ST. Meditations on the Passion of Our Lord. Trans. Revised and Edited by T. A. Murphy, C.SS.R. Irish Messenger (Dublin), 1949. 32p. 3d.
Taken from the *Opere Asetiche* of St. Alphonsus (Rome, 1934).

The HOLY SHROUD of Turin. Holy Shroud Guild, Redemptorist Fathers, Esopus, New York, 1950. 48p. 15c.
Well-illustrated description, with a bibliography. Reprinted from the Mar. 1950 issue of *Perpetual Help*.

71. Way of the Cross

CUSHING, RICHARD J., Abp. of Boston. The Way of the Cross in Short Form. Paulist, 1949. 48p.
Sepia illustrations face the prayers for each station.

DORZWEILER, EDWIN, O.F.M.Cap. Let Us Go with Him. The Way of the Cross (in six forms). Illus. by Gedge Harmon. Catholic Home Journal, 220 37th St., Pittsburgh 1, Pa., 1949. 100p. 25c.
"Each form . . . carries one theme through the fourteen Stations. This method of saying the Way of the Cross may help pious souls to follow the prayerful thoughts closest to their hearts." These are the six themes: 1. For a fuller appreciation of the Sacred Passion. 2. The Mystical Body on the Way of the Cross. 3. Resignation on the Way of the Cross. 4. The Way of the Cross, the way of humility. 5. The Way of the Cross as a preparation for confession. 6. Religious life and the Way of the Cross.

ELSNER, PAUL J., S.M. By Thy Holy Cross. Considerations on the Stations of the Cross. Bruce, 1950. 69p. 75c.
Contents: Ash Wednesday. Refuge of sinners. The helpers of Christ. Sanctity for all. Fall and failure. Life for death. The tomb.

PEPLER, H. D. C. The Stations of the Cross in Mime as Devised for Liturgical Presentation. Blackfriars (Agent: David Hennessy), 1949. 48p. 75c.
Contents: The principle: Necessary explanation of the technique of mime. The word: The explanations and prayers which precede the action. The action: Details of individual movements and combined effort. Photographic illustrations of each station-action.

72. Easter

LORD, DANIEL A., S.J. Suddenly It's Easter. Queen's Work, 1949. 32p. 10c.
A greeting, with envelope.

78. Sacred Vessels and Linens

BRITT, MATTHEW, O.S.B. Church Linens; a Guide for Altar Societies. St. Anthony Guild, 1949. 39p. 15c.
Contents: Materials for altar linens. The altar cloths. The corporal. The pall. The purificator. The finger towel. The credence cover. The communion cloth and paten. The burse for the communion paten. The frontal (antependium). The frontlet. The tabernacle veil. The ciborium veil. The monstrance veil. The amice. The alb. The cincture. The surplice. The altar cover. Washing sacred linens. Veil of the missal stand. Liturgical colors.

Bibliography. References—Not illustrated.

VII. Liturgy. Prayer. Meditation.

80. Prayer. General Works.

O'Brien, Isidore, O.F.M. "Lord, Teach Us to Pray." St. Anthony Guild, 1949. 32p. 10c.
General introduction.

Verschueren, Lucidius, O.F.M. May My Prayer . . . Reflections on Prayer. Karachi, Pakistan, Rotti Press, 1949. 92p.
Partial contents: The great means of salvation. With attention. Aridity. Notes on the history of prayer. Preparation for prayer. The prayer of the Church. Methods of prayer. The Ignatian method. Aspirative prayer. Prayer of loving attention. Mystical prayer.—Trans. from the original Dutch by Fr. Achilles Meersman, O.F.M.

81. Liturgy. General Works

Pius XII, Pope. *Mediator Dei.* Praying with Christ. The Sacred Liturgy. A simplified edition by Rev. Gerald C. Treacy, S.J. Paulist, 1949. 47p.
With study questions.

83. Church Music

Pierik, Marie. When the People Sang. McLaughlin & Reilly, 1949. 32p. 50c.
"A simple treatise on the Gregorian Chant, its history and use."—Abp. Richard J. Cushing, Foreword.

84. Hymns

Strittmatter, Blase, O.S.B. Sacred Latin Hymns. St. Vincent Archabbey, Latrobe, Pa., 1948. 64p. $1.00.
"These hymns from the Breviary and Missal have been arranged with a view of supplying teachers and students with a compact booklet for classroom use. No comments or notes have been given. These can be found in special works, or can be supplied by the teacher. The authors of the hymns have been listed, although in many cases they are only the probable authors. No vocabulary has been added."

85. Collections of Prayers and Meditations

Busch, William. Family Prayers. Liturgical Press, 1949. 15p.
A selection for corporate family use.

VIII. Sacraments. Sacramentals.

91. Baptism

Liturgical Conference, Inc. The New Man in Christ. National Liturgical Week, Boston, Aug. 2-6, 1948. Liturgical Conference, Conception, Mo., 1949. ix, 172p.
Papers and discussion centered on baptism. Contents: The encyclical *Mediator Dei.* What is so new? The new life. Death and resurrection in Christ. Grafted in the vine. Catholic religious art. In the home. The gift of life. From darkness to light. The cycle of life. Making all things new. The mother of all vigils. Unto full stature. The popes and congregational singing.—With illustrations and a full index.

National Catholic Welfare Conference. Family Life Bureau. A Souvenir of Baptism. N.C.W.C., 1949. 22p. 15c.
Primarily intended as a souvenir to the parents from the pastor. It opens with a twelve page message on the privileges and duties of parents.

The Rite of Baptism. Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, 1949. 4p. 10c and 5c.
There are two editions: one for parents (10c) has a baptismal certificate together with the English text of the rite; the smaller edition is for the attendants at the rite.

92. Confirmation

Smiddy, Thomas W. A Manual for the Extraordinary Minister of Confirmation. Bruce, 1949. 118p. $1.25.
Contents: Sacra Congregatio de Disciplina Sacramentorum Decretum. Translation and commentary. Appendices: I. Decree of the Propaganda. II. Decree of the Oriental Congregation.—Elaborate foot-

notes and a two-page index are supplemental.

94. Eucharist. Holy Communion. Devotional Titles.

BOUCHAR, J. "Pray Like That!" Prayers Before and After Holy Communion. Trans. and Adapted from the French by J. Robert Charette. J. R. Charette, 1068 Erie St., E. Windsor, Ontario, 1949. 75p. 25c.

"A book of Communion prayers designed to touch the Most Holy Hearts of Jesus and Mary and to make us *live* the message of Fatima."

LORD, DANIEL A., S.J. Preparation for Holy Communion. Queen's Work, 1949. 32p. 10c.

General advice, together with some prayers and meditation suggestions.

95. Mass

CRAWLEY-BOEVEY, MATEO, SS.CC. The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The Only Hymn of Glory Worthy of the Blessed Trinity. Trans. from the French. National Center of the Enthronement of the Sacred Heart, Brookland, Washington 17, D. C., 1949. 44p. 15c.

A congratulatory letter from Pope Pius XII and a foreword by Abp. Cushing precede these meditations, directed especially to priests.

KIENBERGER, V. F., O.P. At Mass. A Brief Explanation of the Holy Sacrifice for the Laity. Shrine of St. Jude Thaddeus, 1909 S. Ashland Ave., Chicago 8, Ill., 1946. 93p.

Contents: The marvel of the Mass. The story of the Mass. The scene of the Mass. The costume of the Mass. The preparation of the priest. The Mass. Our conduct at Mass. The Missal.

NEYLON, JOHN J. You Ought to Go to Mass. Our Sunday Visitor, 1949. 13p. 10c.

Addressed to the fallen-away Catholic.

97. Penance. Confession.

CONFESSION, the Sacrament of Mercy and Peace. Benedictine Convent of Perpetual Adoration, 1948. 64p. 10c.

Contents: Man's quest for happiness. The sacrament of Penance —its institution, nature and practice. Foreshadowed in the Old Law. The forgiveness of sins in the New Law. What constitutes the sacrament of Penance. Acts of the penitent. Acts of the priest. Other points regarding Confession.

LAWLOR, GILES, O.F.M. Don't be Afraid to Go to Confession. St. Anthony Guild, 1948. 18p. 5c.

Many nervous and mental disorders may be alleviated by confession.

100. Marriage. Home. Family.

ADAM, KARL. Holy Marriage. Liturgical Press, 1949. 22p.

The theme is that of "the sacramental sanctification of marriage and its position and function in the Body of Christ." A reprint from *Orate Fratres.*

CHRISTIAN FAMILY ACTION. For Happier Families: How to Start a C.F.A. Chicago Federation of Christian Family Action, Room 1808, 100 W. Monroe St., Chicago, 1949. 45p. 35c.

After an introductory section on organization, outline plans for fourteen meetings are given.

CLEARY, DAN AND GERTRUDE. A Cana Catechism. By Dan and Gertrude Cleary and Ed and Mary Jane McCarthy. St. Ann's Pamphlet Guild, 4001 Yuma St., Washington 16, D. C. 15p. 5c.

Twenty questions and answers on the Cana Conference Movement, together with a brief history, and a list of "priests in the vanguard," with their addresses.

GRIFFIN, JOHN J. The Dignity of Christian Marriage. Matthew F. Sheehan Co., 22 Chauncy St., Boston, Mass., 1949. 32p. 10c.

The sublimity of matrimony outlined by a layman.

HARRINGTON, EDWARD. Cana Catechism. From the Notes of Edward Dowling, S.J. Queen's Work, 1950. 26p. 10c.

The reasons for Cana groups and Conferences and their methods of organization.

LIEDERBACH, C. A. When a Catholic Marries . . ." Bruce, 1949. 75p. 50c.

Pre-marital instructions, some-

what more frank than the average treatment. Includes the English ritual of marriage and of the Nuptial Mass.

LITURGICAL CONFERENCE, INC. The Family in Christ. National Liturgical Week, Denver, Colo., Oct. 14-17, 1946. Liturgical Conference (Conception, Mo.), 1947. 179p.

Contents: The family and the family of God. The family and parish worship. Restoring family life in Christ. The marriage of Christ and the Church. Liturgy as social sanctification. Marriage as a sacrament. The family and the Eucharist. Family life and the sacraments. Family life and prayer. Family life, the liturgical year and the sacramentals. Liturgy and the family arts. The family and Catholic Action. The family and religious families. Family life and family learning. Summary. Index.

LORD, DANIEL A., S.J. God Bless the Newlyweds. Queen's Work, 1949. 32p. 10c.

Commentary on the actions and liturgy of the Catholic marriage rite.

MCCOWN, JAMES H., S.J. Man, Woman and God. The Three Partners in the Sublime Contract of Marriage. Queen's Work, 1949. 37p. 10c.

The place of marriage in God's plan.

MAHONEY, E. J. Marriage Preliminaries. The Instruction "Sacrosanctum," June 29, 1941, with a Commentary. Newman, 1949. 93p. $1.00.

Contents: Text of the instruction "Sacrosanctum" in Latin and English. Commentary: Purpose. The parties. The investigating priest. Diocesan testimonial and *Nihil Obstat*. Identity and status of the parties. Impediments. Dispensations. Knowledge and consent. Investigation procedure. Canonical form. Documentation.

MEYER, BERNARD F., M.M. A Workbook for Parish Catholic Action, II: The Christian Family in Action. Herman, Pa., Center for Men of Christ the King, 1949. 182p. $1.25.

Detailed study outlines.

MUELLER, THERESE. Family Life in Christ. Liturgical Press, 1946. 32p.

Third edition. Discusses the "possibilities of bringing *home* our religion, that is, of living the liturgy in the family circle."

NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE. FAMILY LIFE BUREAU. The Family Apostolate in Pictures. N.C.W.C., 1949. 32p. 25c.

A picture brochure that shows "the variety of activities that constitute the family life movement of the day."

NOLL, JOHN FRANCIS. Seven Instructions Before Marriage; Also Some Good Matter for Discussion Clubs. Our Sunday Visitor, 1948. 78p. 30c.

Instructions for mixed marriages.

O'BRIEN, JOHN A. Courtship and Marriage. Happiness in the Home. St. Anthony Guild, 1949. 217p. $1.50.

A unification of previously published pamphlets and articles, accompanied by a study club outline.

SCHMIEDELER, EDGAR, O.S.B. Christian Marriage: An Analysis of and Commentary on the Marriage Encyclical. National Catholic Welfare Conference, Family Life Bureau, 1948. 88p. 25c.

Contents: Preface of the encyclical. The nature and blessings of Christian marriage. Errors and vices against Christian marriage. Remedies for the evils against marriage.

SCHMIEDELER, EDGAR, O.S.B., AND SAUSE, BERNARD, O.S.B. The Family, a School of the Virtues. National Catholic Welfare Conference, Family Life Bureau, 1949. 77p. 25c.

Contents: The virtues in general. The virtue of faith. The virtue of hope. The love of God. The love of neighbor. The virtue of prudence. The virtue of justice. The virtue of fortitude. The virtue of temperance. The virtue of humility. The virtue of obedience. The virtues of filial piety and patriotism. The virtue of religion. The virtue of patience. The virtue of truthfulness. The virtue of chastity.

SCHMIEDELER, EDGAR, O.S.B. Looking Toward Marriage. National Catholic Welfare Conference, Family Life Bureau, 1949. 112p. 25c.

Contents: The family situation.

Marriage, natural and supernatural. Steps leading to marriage. Qualifications of a life-partner. The bond of love. The legal regulations of marriage. Economic preparation. Looking toward marriage adjustment. The marriage ceremony. A church in miniature.

SCHMIEDELER, EDGAR, O.S.B. Selected Addresses on Marriage and the Family. National Catholic Welfare Conference, Family Life Bureau, 1949. 78p. 25c.

Talks given at the annual Family Life Conferences. Contents: Social order and the family. Preparation for marriage. The marriage encyclical: blueprint for a restored family life. Patron of Christian fathers. Pattern for mothers. The art of being a good mother. The art of being a good husband. The dignity of Christian fatherhood. The dignity of Christian motherhood. A blueprint for an ideal family. God's plan of marriage.

SCHMIEDELER, EDGAR, O.S.B., Editor. Sermons and Addresses on Marriage and the Family. National Catholic Welfare Conference, Family Life Bureau, 1949. 76p. 25c.

Addresses delivered at Family Life Conferences. Contents: "Blessed are they that dwell in the house of the Lord; They shall praise Thee forever and ever." A great sacrament. Marriage and the home. "Unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." Marriage and the mystical body. The grace of married life. Marriage, natural and supernatural. Marriage and the mystical body (*sic*). The family at prayer. The sacramentals in family life. Domestic virtues. A project for all parents—blessing their children.

107. Birth Control

CALKINS, HUGH, O.S.M. Rhythm, the Unhappy Compromise. Integrity (Agent: David Hennessy), 1949. 11p.

A thorough discussion of moral and other considerations.

MCNABB, VINCENT, O.P. The Ethics and Psychology of Neo-Malthusian Birth-control. Central Bureau (Agent: David Hennessy), 1944. 8p.

An explanation of the Church's attitude toward birth control by modern methods.

108. Child Care

NUTTING, WILLIS. Parents Are Teachers. Liturgical Press, 1949. 18p.

The family, as a spiritual community, must be a part of the educational system. Reprinted from *Orate Fratres.*

109. Youth. Adolescence.

CLAUSE, ROBERT, S.J. The Training of the Adolescent. Practical Advice for Parents. Trans. from the French third ed., by Francis D. Giampino, S.J. Paulist, 1949. 48p.

Contents: The psychology of the adolescent. The training of the adolescent: the training of his intellect; his guidance in sex; the training of his will. Mary's part in his training.

110. Standards of Conduct for Youth

TREACY, ANNE C. I'm Going to High School. Paulist, 1949. 32p. 10c.

Guidance and good manners for Catholic youth, No. 2.

TREACY, ANNE C. Looking Ahead. Paulist, 1949. 31p. 10c.

Guidance and good manners for Catholic youth, No. 3. A pamphlet on choosing a vocation and on mingling with the other sex.

TREACY, ANNE C. Successful Living. Paulist, 1949. 23p. 10c.

Guidance and good manners for Catholic youth, No. 4. Contents: Use of leisure time. Courtesy in Church. Catholic citizenship. True refinement.

TREACY, ANNE C. Watch Your Manners. Paulist, 1949. 32p. 10c.

Guidance and good manners for Catholic youth, No. 1.

111. Sex Education

FRANK YOUTH QUIZZES ON SEX. Radio Replies Press, 1943. 32p. 10c.

Contents: Necking. Free love. Sex education. Courtship. Abortion. Mother or baby.

113. Extreme Unction. Death. Euthanasia

FORD, JOHN C., S.J. Mercy Murder. America, 1950. 16p. 10c.
Against the background of the Sander case, the arguments against euthanasia are advanced.

115. Sacramentals

MCKENNA, P. Holy Water. Its Origin, Symbolism and Use. Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, 1948. 24p. 2d.

IX. CHRISTIAN LIFE. SPIRITUAL LIFE. CONDUCT OF LIFE.

121. General Works

BENJAMIN, C. P. The Priceless Gift. Passion Press, 414 W. Pratt St., Baltimore, 1949. 45p.
"A short explanation of faith, the beginning of eternal life."

BENARD, EDMOND D. The Everlasting Kingdom. Our Sunday Visitor, 1948. 51p. 25c.
Catholic Hour Addresses, Sept. 5—Oct. 31, 1948. Contents: The image of the King. No king but Caesar. The heirs of the kingdom. The King's highway. Christ's kingdom on earth. The keys of the kingdom. The kingdom of heaven. The Queen of angels. Christ the King.

BLOY, LEON. Four Comfortable Sayings: Essays. Trans. by Bernard Wall. Sower Press (Agent: David Hennessy), 1949. 7p. 50c.
Reprinted from *Colosseum*. Contents: Business is business. Health before everything. Appetite comes with eating. No smoke without fire.—Edition limited to 180 copies.

CASEY, DERMOT, S.J. The Nature and Treatment of Scruples. Newman, 1948. 66p. 90c.
Not intended for the scrupulous person but for the confessor.

DU COEUR DE JESUS, M. M. AM., O.D.C. A Soul of Silence: Sister Elizabeth of the Trinity. Trans. from the French, by a Discalced Carmelite. Newman, 1949. 40p. 50c.
On the element of silence in the spiritual life.

LAWSON, W., S.J. Alive, Alive, O. The Meaning of Mortification. Catholic Truth Society (London), 1948. 16p. 3d.
Mortification as a life-producing means.

LORD, DANIEL A., S.J. Nobody Loves a Tease! Queen's Work, 1949. 31p. 10c.
How teasing, "the cruelest and obviously the least civilized form of wit," can harm persons.

MCCARTHY, JOHN M. Not by Bread Alone. Our Sunday Visitor, 1949. 29p. 20c.
Four Catholic Hour Addresses, Nov. 7-28, 1948. Contents: Secularism. Scepticism. Science. Salvation.

MANTON, JOSEPH, C.SS.R. Give Him a Thought. Our Sunday Visitor, 1949. 24p. 20c.
Four Catholic Hour Addresses, Dec. 5-26, 1948. Contents: A new chance. A new welcome. A new Child. A new resolve.

MARTINDALE, C. C., S.J. Counsels and Prayers for Men in the Navy and Merchant-Marine. Central Bureau, 1947. 16p.

MIRIAM, SISTER, R.S.M. No Peace but One. Thinkers Digest Booklet, College Misericordia, Dallas, Pa., 1950. 8p. 10c.
An essay on the need of contemplating Christ.

O'BRIEN, JOHN A. You Can Win Converts. Heeding a Divine Invitation. Queen's Work, 1949. 36p. 10c.
Some beginning pointers.

PUGH, LIEBIE. Abide in Me. With an Introduction by Dom Hubert van Zeller. Catholic Truth Society (London), 1948. 50p. 3d.
This "has for its sole object a deepened realisation of union with Our Divine Lord in any who are drawn to read it."

ROONEY, RICHARD L., S.J. You Are So Important. Queen's Work, 1949. 32p. 10c.
"A bow to the laity" for the work they are doing in furthering the kingdom of Christ.

SHEEN, FULTON J. The Love That Waits for You. Our Sunday Visitor, 1949. 112p. 35c.

Sixteen Catholic Hour Addresses, Jan. 2—Apr. 17, 1949. Contents: The two trap-doors of the soul. The perils of a false conscience. What makes us afraid of God. Moral conditions of finding God. Self-knowledge. Asceticism. The need of grace. Actual grace. Sanctifying grace. How to build character. The sanctification of the now-moment. Meditation. Reparation for sins. Taste and see that the Lord is sweet. For those who have the faith. Easter.

SOUTHARD, R. E., S.J. Problems of Decency. Queen's Work, 1949. 39p. 10c.

This booklet is intended to "help persons in dealing with confessors, whether it be for their own guidance or for others. (However) it is merely an outline." Offers some practical guidance in avoiding pitfalls in sexual relations.

THÉRÈSE OF THE CHILD JESUS, ST. Little Catechism of the Act of Oblation of St. Therese of the Child Jesus, Trans. by Rev. Michael Collins in collaboration with Carmel of Kilmacud (Co. Dublin). Newman, 1950. 22p. 25c.

An attempt "to fix more definitely in accordance with the original texts of the Saint and the instructions she gave to her novices, her attitude of mind on the subject of this *Act*, new in the Annals of Holy Church, and which burst spontaneously from her heart at the full height of her spiritual life."

TONNE, ARTHUR, O.F.M. Personality Plus. How to Improve Your Personality with the Help of Jesus and Francis. A New Approach to the Following of Christ. Didde Printing Co., Emporia, Kansas, 1949. 70p.

Contents: Why "plus." Tact. Courtesy. Generosity. Conversation. Appearance. A sense of humor. The will to work. Stick-to-it-iveness. Self-control. Sincerity. Keeping promises. Poise. Tolerance. Ability to take the opposite sex casually. The magnetic Master.

VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE. RELIGIOUS LIFE.

124. General Works

CANONICAL Legislation Concerning Religious. Authorized English Translation. Newman, 1948. 74p. 75c.

"The present translation is intended for those Religious of both sexes who cannot easily utilize the official Latin text of the Code of Canon Law. With the exception of certain canons, which exclusively concern clerical institutes, it comprises practically the whole of the Second Part of the Second Book which treats of Religious together with an appendix containing other canons drawn from other parts of the Code, and likewise referring to Religious. Although this translation has been specially authorized by the Holy See, it has not the official character of the Latin text."

FOLLOW CHRIST: 1950 (edition). The Grail, 1950. 96p. 25c.

A series of essays on vocations religious and lay; well illustrated. Similar volumes for the years 1946, 1948 and 1949 are still in print.

LOVASIK, LAWRENCE G., S.V.D. Monthly Spiritual Renewal. Catechetical Guild, 1948. 40p. 15c.

For use by religious. Contents: Thanksgiving. Examination of conscience. Contrition. The purpose of amendment. Preparation for death.

MATHIS, MICHAEL A., C.S.C. Medical Mission Vocation. Medical Mission Sisters, 1934. 15p.

The need of more vocations to the medical mission field.

POAGE, GODFREY, C.P. Have You Heard Christ's Call? Catholic Information Society, 1948. 31p. 25c.

Deals with the priesthood, brotherhood and sisterhood; supplies a four page list of religious orders for further information.

125. Vocations for Men. Priesthood. Brotherhood. Lay Vocations. General Works.

HANNAN, WERNER, O.F.M.Cap. Christ's Minutemen. Catholic Home Journal, 220 37th St., Pittsburgh 1, 1948. 144p. Paper, $1.00; cloth, $1.75.

"Purpose is to paint in broad out-

line the infancy of each religious institute, outstanding members, and the type of work which individuates this particular group from every other. The original idea was to select the twelve largest religious bodies of men in this country." Contents: The Benedictines. The Friars Minor Observants and Conventuals. The Dominicans. The Augustinians. The Capuchins. The Jesuits. The Vincentians. The Redemptorists. The Passionists. The Holy Cross Fathers. The Precious Blood Fathers. The Oblate Fathers.—The appendix lists other communities of priests and brothers in the U. S.

ST. PAUL SEMINARY, St. Paul Minn. The Foundations of the Seminarian's Spiritual Life. The Seminary, 2200 Grand Ave., St. Paul 1, Minn., 1948. 71p. 50c.

"A series of meditations on the means of perfection — correlated with the Life of Christ and the prayers of the Rite of Tonsure— together with suggestions for the particular examen and spiritual reading."

126. Religious Orders for Men

Note: It would not be possible to mention vocational titles issued by all orders. This is a sampling of the major titles that have come to the attention of the compiler since the last supplement.

Benedictines

PIUS XI, POPE. Like a Star. Grail, 1947. 48p.

The encyclical on St. Benedict in which the Holy Father "vividly describes how the Holy Rule of St. Benedict, followed by his monks for fourteen hundred years, in its wisdom and prudence is 'Like a Star' which could guide the restless hearts of men and women in our troubled world to real peace, if they did but listen and learn from St. Benedict to seek God." Text on left side; commentary on the right. Illustrated.

Christian Brothers

L. ALPHONSUS, BROTHER, F.S.C. "Come, Follow Me." Religious Education Bureau, 1947. 32p.

Cistercians

The CISTERCIANS of the Common Observance. Cistercian Monastery, Our Lady of Spring Bank, Okauchee, Wis., 1944. 35p.

Franciscans

FOLLOW, FRANCIS. Thoughts on the Franciscan Brotherhood. Seraphic Society for Vocations, 1615 Vine St., Cincinnati 10, 1948. 24p. 25c.

Highly illustrated.

SKYPILOTS. Tom Wester Joins the Franciscans. Seraphic Society (as above), 1949. 32p. Gratis.

Mary Immaculate, Oblates of

TOMORROW WHERE? Oblates of Mary Immaculate, 225 Fargo Ave., Buffalo 13, N. Y. (n.d.). 48p.

Highly illustrated.

Mercy, Fathers of

The SOCIETY of the FATHERS OF MERCY. Vocation Manual. The Society, 11 De Sales Place, Brooklyn 7, N. Y. (n.d.). 16p.

Our Lady of Mercy, Fathers of

The ORDER of the FATHERS OF OUR LADY OF MERCY. Our Lady of Mercy Monastery, Berea, Ohio (n.d.). 20p. Gratis.

Passionists

WEAVER, BERTRAND, C.P. Preachers of the Passion. Holy Cross Preparatory Seminary, Dunkirk, N. Y., 1943. 20p.

Describes the life of a Passionist.

Paulists

MCGINN, JOHN T., C.S.P. The Training of a Paulist. Director of Vocations, 415 W. 59th St., New York 19, N. Y., 1944. 16p.

Resurrectionists

FOR GOD AND MAN: 1842-1942. A short History of the Congregation of the Resurrection. Cantian Press, 3689 W. Pine, St. Louis, 1942. 53p.

Sacred Heart, Missionaries

The MISSIONS Call for Priests and Brothers. Missionaries of the Sacred Heart, Geneva, Ill., 1945. 22p.

Sacred Heart, Priests of

The CHALLENGE. By a Student for the Priesthood in the Society of the Priests of the Sacred Heart. Sacred Heart Monastery, Hales Corners, Wis. 42p. Gratis.

cator, Mont La Salle, Napa, Calif., 1943. 24p.
Describes the vocation of a teaching brother.

127. Vocations for Women. Sisterhood, Nursing, etc.

MOFFATT. J. E., S.J. Sponsa Christi, a Portrait. Bruce, 1949. 31p. 25c.
Meditative essay on the vocation of a religious.

128. Religious Orders for Women

Assumption Sisters

The LITTLE SISTERS OF THE ASSUMPTION. Nursing Sisters of the Poor in Their Own Home. Catholic Truth Society of Ireland (n.d.). 32 p.
Historical and vocational title.

Dominicans

SISTERS OF THE ORDER OF ST. DOMINIC. An Open Letter to Catholic Girls. Author, Mt. St. Mary-on-the Hudson, Newburgh, N. Y., 1944. 60p. Gratis.
Illustrated.

Medical Mission Sisters

GOODALL, FRANCIS P., C.S.C. The First Medical Mission Congregation. Medical Mission Sisters, 8400 Pine Road, Fox Chase, Philadelphia 11, Pa. 10p.
The early history of the Medical Mission Sisters, founded by Dr. Agnes McLaren and Dr. Anna Dengel.

X. MISSIONS

135. General Works

CATHOLIC STUDENTS MISSIONARY CRUSADE. A Missionary Index to Catholic Americans. Sixth edition. C.S.M.C., 1949. 167p. $1.00.
The 1949 list of Catholic priests and religious of the U. S. in missionary work outside the U. S. A., is based on reports as of July 1, 1945. Tables show comparative statistics for periods between 1940 and 1949, and the distribution of personnel by countries and societies.

CHARLES, PIERRE, S.J. Medical Missions. America, 1949. 32p. 40c.
"The necessity for medical missions, their history, development and the many obstacles to be overcome in their fulfillment." Missionary Academia Study, v. 6, no. 5, Jan. 1949. With study questions and bibliography.

CLARK, FRANCIS X., S.J. The Purpose of Missions. A Study of Mission Documents of the Holy See, 1909-1946. Missionary Union of the Clergy, 109 E. 38th St., New York City, 1948. 65p. 40c.
Contents: The problem. Gospel, faith and conversion. The Church. Integration and conclusion. Bibliography.

MURPHY, EDWARD L., S.J. Beachheads Won for Christ. A Study of the Motives Behind the Catholic Mission Movement. Foreword by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Thomas J. McDonnell. Jesuit Philippine Bureau, 1943. 31p.
Contents: The new humanity. The missionary Church. Misunderstanding the missions. What missions really mean. Must there be missions? The missionary sacraments. The mission appeal. Summary. The missionary vocation. What we can do. Mission opportunity.

136. Mission History

MCGINN, JOHN T., C.S.P. The conversion of non-Catholics in the United States. America, 1949. 31p. 40c.
"The major mission problem today with suggested methods of fulfilling this apostolate. Contents: An unfinished task. Preliminary approaches to convert-making. The inquiry class. The role of the laity. Specialized techniques. Types of inquiries and their difficulties. Bibliography. Study outline.

NOBELS, ALBERT, I.H.M. Catholic Missions in the Belgian Congo. The Present Situation and Problems of the Catholic Missioners with a Brief Historical Survey. America, 1949. 30p. 40c.
Contents: General considerations. Historical survey of evangelization in the Belgian Congo. How the Congo natives were converted to Catholicism. Method of apostolate. Problems of a modern apostolate.

Financial problem of the missions. Religious practice and moral situation of the modern Catholics. Catholic missions versus Protestant missions. The Catholic missioner in the Congo. Conclusion. Bibliography. Study outline.—Missionary Academia Study, vol. 7, no. 3, Nov. 1949.

RUSKOWSKI, LEO F., S.S., French Missions in North America. The Endeavors, Accomplishments, Martyrdoms of the French Missionaries in the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries. America, 1949. 48p. 40c.

Contents: French Missions in North America. Missions in Maine. Missions in New York. Northwestern missions. The Illinois missions. Louisiana's missions. Ministry in the East. Ministry in the West. Conclusion. Bibliography. Study outline.—Missionary Academia Study, vol. 6, no. 7, Mar. 1949.

XI. PROTESTANT CHURCHES

141. Anglicanism

LEO XIII, POPE. *Apostolicae curae.* Anglican Orders. Encyclical Letter. With Discussion Club Outline by Rev. Gerald C. Treacy, S.J. Paulist, 1949. 24p. 10c.

XII. SOCIAL SCIENCES

156. Economics

BIBLE. SELECTIONS. The Rich and the Poor. A Biblical Anthology Compiled from the Douay Version. London, Coldwell (Agent: David Hennessy), 1938. 64p. 1/.

Extracts, without commentary, from both Testaments.

PEPLER, H. D. C. The Cross of God. London, Distributist Books (Agent: David Hennessy) (n.d.). 40p. 40c.

"Essays concerned with the use of the property called gold."

157.2 Distributism

BELLOC, HILAIRE. An Essay on the Restoration of Property. London, Distributist Books (Agent: David Hennessy), 1948. 88p. 50c.

R. D. Jebb has written an Introduction to this second edition. While the thesis is limited to English conditions, many arguments apply to other countries.

(CAREY, GRAHAM). A Declaration of the Independents. Sower Press, for the Distributist League (Agent: David Hennessy), 1940? 44p. 75c.

A restatement of the distributist program in American terms.

MCDONOUGH, JOHN J. An Outline of the Social Philosophy Known as Distributism. St. Joseph's Protectory for Homeless Boys (Agent: David Hennessy), 1939. 12p.

A summary of radio addresses, reprinted from the Pittsburgh *Catholic.* Bibliography.

SAGAR, S. Distributism. Distributist Books (Agent: David Hennessy) (n.d.). 20p. 35c.

A reprint of six articles from the Weekly Review, based on the principles in Belloc's *Servile State* and other sources.

158. Cooperative Associations

SULLIVAN, MAURICE N. "Scorn of the Land" (Agent: David Hennessy), 1949. 20p. 10c.

"First in a series of talks on the general theme: Co-ops can rebuild our vanishing democracy."

160. Agriculture. Rural Life.

PIUS XII, POPE. The Pope Speaks on Rural Life. Nov. 15, 1946. National Catholic Rural Life Conference (Agent: David Hennessy), 1946. 16p. 10c.

An address to the delegates of the Convention of the National Confederation of Farm Owner-Operators.

167. Political Science

BRUEHL, CHARLES. The State and the People. The Drift Toward State Socialism and Totalitarianism. Central Bureau, 1950. 26p.

Some comments on the American political scene.

169. Communism

PIUS XI, POPE. *Divini Redemptoris.* On Atheistic Communism. Encyclical Letter . . . Mar. 19, 1937. With Out-

line and Index by Francis Joseph Brown. Outline Press, Chicago 12, Ill., 1949. 71p. 50c.

The translation is that of Rev. Lewis Watt, S.J. There is a five page index. *Outline encyclical series,* v. II.

WILSON, RAYMOND J., JR. Communism: A Catholic Survey. A Source Book with Discussion Club Outlines. Catholic Students Mission Crusade, 1949. 121p. $1.00.

"A documented history of modern Communism, together with an analysis of the principal doctrines and propaganda methods of Communism and outlines for a Christian counter-program of social action. Discussion outlines are appended to each chapter." Bibliography. *Problems of the Living Church Series.*

177. Peace and War

ATTWATER, DONALD. Bombs, Babies & Beatitudes. London, James Clarke (Agent: David Hennessy), 1939. 16p. 25c.

In defense of Christian pacifism. "We have the duty to refuse to resist evil, and what is represented to us as evil, by means of war as now waged, both because of the intrinsic wickedness of modern war and because Christian ends cannot be attained by organized hate and violence."

BELLOC, HILAIRE. The Catholic and the War. Burns Oates (Agent: David Hennessy), 1940. 31p. 6d.

Discusses the questions, "What should be the attitude of the Catholic *as* Catholic toward the War quite apart from his national allegiance? What is his duty in the matter, not as a citizen, but as a member of the Church Universal?"

CLASBY, WILLIAM J. Building Blocks for Peace. Our Sunday Visitor, 1949. 32p. 25c.

Hour of Faith Addresses, Jan. 2-30, 1949. Contents: Blueprint for peace. The cornerstone of peace. Strong timbers. Mary's teen-agers. The voice of the children.

DAWSON, CHRISTOPHER. The Renewal of Civilisation. London, National Peace Council (Agent: David Hennessy), 1943. 11p. 20c.

Western civilization will be renewed only through a return to spiritual values.

FITZROY, MARK, Ed. War, Conscience and the Rule of Christ. Compiled from the Encyclicals of Leo XIII, Benedict XV, Pius XI, and Pius XII. With a Foreword by Eric Gill. Pax Society (Agent: David Hennessy), 1940. 19p. 25c.

"The following quotations from Papal Encyclicals over a period of sixty years are intended to make clear firstly the teaching of the Popes concerning the causes, methods and results of modern war; secondly, the Papal teaching with regard to conscience, and the necessity of obedience to its judgment; and finally, the true and only effectual way of dealing with the troubles of our time."

GILL, ERIC. The Bond of Peace. The Human Person and Society. London, Peace Pledge Union (Agent: David Hennessy), 1940. 23p. 25c.

A Christian definition of the human person in the light of modern institutions, as democracy, capitalism, etc.

PIUS XII, POPE. 1948 Christmas Message, Dec. 23, 1948. National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1949. 11p. 10c.

Reflections on the "present state of humanity and of Christendom."

SCARFE, HUBERT GRANT, Ed. A Catholic Approach to the Problem of War. A Symposium. London, Pax (Agent: David Hennessy) (n.d.). 64p. 40c.

Contents: The PAX statement of principles and aims. Into the way of peace. "Not by such means. . . ." A Catholic's statement of conscientious objection to modern war. A note on conscience. Catholic and pacifist. A peace broadcast. The C. O. and the Catholic clergy. Why not industrialism? England and the countryman. A note on Christian unity. A Catholic considers community. Warning to peace-makers.

VANN, GERALD, O.P. The Psychology of War-mongering. London, Sands (Agent: David Hennessy), 1938. 20p. 20c.

A Christian answer to "hate propa-

ganda."

WATKINS, E. I. The Crime of Conscription. London, James Clarke (Agent: David Hennessy), 1939. 16p. 25c.

A summation of arguments against war and the forced draft.

178. Church and State

COAKLEY, THOMAS F. Separation of Church and State. Catholic Truth Society, 6202 Alder St., Pittsburgh 6, Pa., 1949. 11p. 10c.

"Church and state have never been separated in America, Catholic schools and public schools are partners, not competitors, in education. Public schools are only a part of the American school system. Catholic schools are a very important section of American education. Therefore, Catholic schools are entitled to Federal aid."

DUNNE, GEORGE H., S.J. Religion and American Democracy. A Reply to Paul Blanshard's *American Freedom and Catholic Power*. America, 1949. 48p. 25c.

Contents: Preface to criticism. The great Catholic conspiracy. The Church and democracy. Catholic schools. The Church and medicine. The Church and science. Church and state.—Reprint of articles that appeared originally in *America* between June 4 and July 30, 1949.

MURRAY, JOHN COURTNEY, S.J. Governmental Repression of Heresy. Catholic Theological Society, 1949. 75p.

A thorough essay on whether the "principle of civil intolerance is inherent in the Catholic doctrine of the Church and the state." Much of this phase of the church-state topic centers around a paragraph of the late Msgr. John A. Ryan in which he implied that legal repression of heresy becomes expedient when Catholics are in a majority. Reprinted, with revisions, from the Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America.

179. History

GILSON, ETIENNE. The Terrors of the Year Two Thousand. St. Michael's College, Toronto (Agent: David Hennessy), 1949. 31p. 50c.

A Christian analysis of today's problems and the prospects for the future.

MALOOF, LOUIS J. Truth about China's Crisis. Our Sunday Visitor, 1949. 143p.

Analysis of the Communist influence in China and of our foreign policy.

XIII. EDUCATION

185. General Works. Federal Aid.

FINK, F. A. Pierce the Confusion and See the Child. Our Sunday Visitor, 1949. 64p. 20c.

"A discussion of federal aid."

HARTNETT, ROBERT C., S.J. Federal Aid to Education. The Rights of Children Attending Non-public Schools. A Sequel to *Equal Rights for Children*. America, 1950. 48p. 25c.

Contents: The issue before Congress. The rights of citizens of the United States. Why the furor about buses? The church-state issue. The constitution and "separation of church and state." Selected bibliography.

HARTNETT, ROBERT C., S.J. Ed. The Right to Educate. Democracy and Religious Education: A Symposium. America, 1949. 48p. 25c.

A comparison of the treatment of religious education by four other great democracies with the American system. Contents: The Dutch show the way, by E. F. Schroeder, S.J. Canada lets parents choose, by Donald J. Pierce. Australia: a study in courage, by William Keane, S.J. Britain revamps her system, by Terence Quirk. Is religious education divisive? By Robert C. Hartnett, S.J.

McCLUSKEY, NEIL G., S.J. Federal Aid to Private Schools? Queen's Work, 1950. 40p. 10c.

A popularized statement of the case and the major principles involved.

REED, GEORGE E. The McCollum Case and Your Child. National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1948. 14p. 15c.

An address delivered at the 1948 convention of the National Council

of Catholic Women. Bibliography.

SHEA, FRANCIS R. The School, Your Child's Other Home. Our Sunday Visitor, 1949. 44p. 20c.

Faith in Our Time Talks, Sept. 2 —Oct. 28, 1948. Contents: Meet Johnny's teacher. Education and happiness. Good jobs go to the well educated. We have to get along with people. What about God? Can education afford to ignore God? God and morality. What about college? The home, your child's other school.

XIV. LEISURE. READING LISTS. PRESS.

194. Leisure

LORD, DANIEL A., S.J. Your New Leisure and How to Use It. Queen's Work, 1950. 32p. 10c.

Suggests proper recreational and avocational uses of leisure.

LUELLA, SISTER MARY, O.P. The Catholic Booklist, 1949. Edited for the Catholic Library Assn. Rosary College, River Forest, Ill., 1949. 86p. 65c.

The subjects covered are the same as in the 1950 volume *(infra)*, with different titles, of course.

STELLA MARIS, SISTER, O.P. The Catholic Booklist, 1950. Edited for the Catholic Library Assn. St. Catherine Junior College, St. Catherine, Ky., 1950. 74p. 65c.

"An annotated bibliography, for the most part Catholic in authorship or subject matter, chosen as a guide to the recreational and instructional reading of Catholics." Contents: Bibliography and library science. Biography. Education. Fiction. Fine arts. General reference. History and description. Literature (excluding fiction). Mission literature. Philosophy. Religion. Social sciences (excluding history). Children's and young people's section. Index of authors and titles.

BRUNST, G. R. Religion in the News. National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1949. 8p. Gratis.

The place of the Catholic press. Reprint from *Catholic Action*, Dec. 1948.

202. Plays

DRAUGELIS, REV., S.J. Life of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God. A Series of Mystery Plays Based upon "The Mystical City of God" by the Venerable Abbess Mary of Jesus of Agreda, Spain.—"Madonna of Nazareth" in Three Acts. Marian Fathers, Eden Hill, Stockbridge, Mass., 1949. 119p. $1.00.

Some of the hidden life of the Blessed Virgin portrayed as revealed to the Abess Mary of Jesus.

CHESTERTON, GILBERT KEITH. Gloria in Profundis. Wood engravings by Eric Gill. London, Faber & Gwyer (Agent: David Hennessy) (n.d.). 4p.

A chorus from an unfinished play.

XV. BIOGRAPHY

206. Individual Biography

St. Anthony of Padua

MATTHEW, FATHER, S.S.P. St. Anthony, the Wonder Worker. Apostolate of the Press, St. Paul Monastery Press, Canfield, Ohio, 1949. 53p.

A popular biography with devotional exercises.

E. Boyd Barrett

BARRETT, E. BOYD. Prayer for Stray Shepherds. America, 1949. 10p. 10c.

A plea to Catholics to remember in their prayers those priests who have strayed as did the author.

Gilbert Keith Chesterton

PENN, CHRISTOPHER, Pseud. G. K. Chesterton. A Review of Maisie Ward's Great Book. Catholic Writer's Movement (Agent: David Hennessy) (n.d.). 13p. 10c.

St. Clare of Assisi

DEVAS, DOMINIC, O.F.M. St. Clare of Assisi. Catholic Truth Society (London), 1949. 16p. 3d.

Christopher Columbus

STECK, FRANCIS BORGIA. Christopher Columbus and the Franciscans. Academy of American Franciscan History, Bethesda, Md., 1947. 48p. 50c.

An historical sketch from the time of the Tertiary Raymond Lull's

prophecy in 1315 to Columbus' death. Reprinted from *The Americas*, Jan. 1947.

Dorothy Day

DAY, DOROTHY. On Pilgrimage. Catholic Worker Books (Agent: David Hennessy), 1948. 175p. $1.00.

An autobiographical journal of one year's action and thoughts on the life of a Christian.

Alfred William Fairhurst

MCCLUSKEY, NEIL G., S.J. Short Flight to Heaven. Queen's Work, 1949. 40p. 10c.

Life of an exemplary Jesuit novice, Alfred William Fairhurst.

John, Cardinal Glennon

IN MEMORIAM; John Cardinal Glennon. St. Louis Cathedral Rectory, 4431 Lindell Blvd., St. Louis 8, Mo., 1946. 40p. Gratis.

Biographical sketch, funeral sermon and tributes.

St. Jerome

RISCHER, JAMES A., C.M. St. Jerome, the Hermit. Paulist, 1949. 31p.

A biography.

John A. McGuinness

JOHN A. MCGUINNESS, Friend to the Poor. *Irish Messenger*, 1948. 20p. 3d.

An anonymous biography by a fellow worker of the Irish layman who spent out his life in charity.

Blessed Maria Goretti

CARR, JOHN, C.SS.R. Blessed Maria Goretti, Martyr for Purity. Foreword by His Lordship, Most Rev. D. Moynihan. Dublin, Clonmore and Reynolds, 1949. 71p. 3/6.

A biography based on two popular Italian works by Frs. Sgariglia and Aurelio.

GITS, ALEXANDER, S.J. A Modern Virgin Martyr: Blessed Maria Goretti. Catholic Truth Society (London), 1949. 16p. 3d.

Josef, Cardinal Mindszenty

BABIS, DANIEL GEORGE. Cardinal Mindszenty, Victim or Victor? Paulist, 1949. 32p. 10c.

A recounting of the incidents of the famous trial written in order to stir up in hearts "a love for God through His humble servant, Cardinal Mindszenty, and a resolve to pray for the follower of Christ."

Theresa Neumann

BURRUS, E. J., S.J. A Mystic of Our Time: Theresa Neumann of Konnersreuth. Our Sunday Visitor (n.d.). 21p. 20c.

Biographical sketch.

Ellen Organ (Little Nellie of Holy God)

GIBBONS, MARGARET. Little Nellie of Holy God. With a Foreword by Most Rev. John Gregory Murray. Newman, 1949. 48p. 75c.

The Life of Ellen (Nellie) Organ who died on Feb. 2, 1908, at the age of four and a half, after a saintly life.

St. Paschal Baylon, O.F.M.

MINDORFF, ELGAR, O.F.M. Man of the Eucharist: St. Paschal Baylon, O.F.M. St. Francis Book Shop, 1618 Vine St., Cincinnati, 10, Ohio, 1949. 38p. 10c.

Biographic sketch based on the 1907 life by Father Autebert Groeteken.

St. Philomena

SAINT PHILOMENA, Pray for Us! Benedictine Convent of Perpetual Adoration, 1949. 64p. 10c.

Biography, with prayers.

George Herman ("Babe") Ruth

TED, FATHER, S.S.P. "King of Swat." Apostolate of the Press, Canfield, Ohio, 1949. 47p.

Popular anecdotes about "Babe" Ruth.

Mother Frances Schervier

PAULINE, SISTER. Frances Schervier, Mother of the Poor. Sisters of the Poor of St. Francis, Hartwell, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1946. 89p.

An illustrated biography, with an introduction by Abp. Amleto Cicognani.

SCHERVIER, FRANCES. Words of Frances Schervier. Selected and Arranged by Sister Pauline. Sisters of the Poor of St. Francis, Hartwell, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1946. 93p.

A biography by the Most Rev. John T. McNicholas precedes the chrestomathy, arranged for each day of the year.

Elizabeth Ann Seton

McNAMARA, JOHN M., Aux. Bp. of Washington. Mother Elizabeth Ann Seton, Model of Catholic Womanhood. St. Joseph's College, Emmitsburg, Md., 1947. 15p.

A sermon delivered Apr. 13, 1947, on the occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Alumnae Association of St. Joseph's College.

Margaret Sinclair

STANG, JOSEPH, Margaret Sinclair, Helper of the Unemployed. St. Anthony Guild, 1942. 26p. 5c.

The life of a Scottish girl (1900-1925) who became a member of the Poor Clares (then called Sister Mary Frances of the Five Holy Wounds). An account of favors received is appended.

Matt Talbot

GLYNN, JOSEPH A. Life of Matt Talbot, 1856-1925. Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, 1949. 110p. 3/.

A reprint of the 1942 fourth edition. In addition to the biographical material, there are a description of the beatification cause, a prayer for his canonization, the pastoral letter of Abp. Byrne of Dublin, and eight illustrations.

XVI. JUVENILE PAMPHLETS (Written for Children)

J.11. Bible

TREACY, GERALD C., S.J. Bible Stories for Children. Paulist, 1949. Two parts, 10c each.

Stories of the missionary journeys of St. Paul the Apostle, and of the acts of the apostles.

J.48. Blessed Virgin Mary

BEEBE, CATHERINE. Days of Praise for Mary Our Mother. St. Anthony Guild, 1949. 79p. $1.00.

Stories, pictures and prayers for each of the major feasts of the Virgin.

J.95. Mass

D., S.M., O.P. Holy Mass for Little Children. Catholic Truth Society (London), 1948. 32p. 3d.

An illustrated missal-manual.

J.206. Biography

St. Francis of Assisi

ARUNDEL, EUSEBIUS, O.F.M. Stories about St. Francis Retold from the "Little Flowers." Illus. by Robb Beebe. St. Anthony Guild, 1948. 79p. 75c.

Book Three: Marvelous Happenings: St. Francis and the wolf. A dinner and a fire. St. Clare goes to midnight Mass. The priest and the vineyard. St. Anthony's sermon to the fishes. Brother Juniper's feast. Brother Juniper's kindness.

ARUNDEL, EUSEBIUS, O.F.M. Stories about St. Francis Retold from the "Little Flowers." Illus. by Robb Beebe. St. Anthony Guild, 1949. 84p. 75c.

Book Four: Good Example: St. Clare obeys the pope. St. Francis prays for Brother Elias. Brother Elias. Brother John Helps Brother James. St. Francis nurses the leper. St. Francis answers Brother Matthew. Brother Juniper plays seesaw. Brother Juniper keeps silent. Brother Giles trusts in God.

EUGENE P. WILLGING

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

MISSION INTENTION

"Christians in Moslem Lands" is the Mission Intention for the month of July, 1950.

A PAUSE FOR THANKS

If he had not been a wise and experienced pastor, I might have paid his head-shaking comment only the briefest inattention. But he was the kind of priest who builds a magnificent parish plant and then peoples it with worshippers in love with the parish devotional life and who has during the years cultivated a long, long line of penitents to whom he gives absolution from sin, and quiet spiritual guidance for their progress in virtuous living. So when he spoke, young priest that I was at the time, I listened—and was startled.

"I'm not at all sure," he said, and his voice was sad as only frustrated hope can be, "that frequent Communion may not have been a mistake." "Oh," he protested, when he saw me wince at what seemed to me near-heresy, "for many it has been a glorious privilege. It has done the things that the saintly Pius dreamed might happen—including the giving to the Church children saints. I have often wondered what might have been the fate of the world if it had ridden through the last years without frequent Communion." (When he was speaking, World War I was over and the world was experiencing the early depression that followed the Ticker-tape era.)

"But did we rush into it too fast, I wonder, this new and yet ancient practice? Were we priests quite ready for it? Did we fail to get the people properly prepared? And did we have such implicit faith in the *ex opere operato* of the sacrament that we failed to instruct the people in the importance of co-operation?

"I am shocked, and yet I find myself not knowing what to do when after rail upon rail of people have received Holy Communion at my Mass, I finish the prayers at the foot of the altar to the sound of a stampede. Out from the church pell-mell dash the very people who a few moments before were piously welcoming the Eucharistic Christ. Their welcome looked devout. But their thanksgiving. . . . what about their thanksgiving? Don't they remember that the Sacred Species are still within them? Have they no concept of the value of those moments following Holy Communion?

"When I was a youngster, we were taught as a matter of pedagogical routine how St. Aloysius received Holy Communion: one

day of preparation, one precious day of reception, and one day of thanksgiving. And as a part of our own schooling for first Holy Communion we were taught the essential value of the thanksgiving that followed every Communion. Oh I know . . . kidlike we too bolted out of church—if we could. But when we did, it was with a guilty feeling. We knew we should be staying, and in the midst of our dash we might even manage an apology to the dear Lord.

"Holy Communion is of itself transcendently valuable. But by a saintly Pope we were precipitated into frequent Communion, and I wonder whether the people are using that privilege with anything like the appreciation they should show or with the intelligence that means the difference between Christ's struggle to give grace and the soul's willingness to receive it."

The passage of years, my contact with more parish churches than I could possibly count, the dull shuffle of retreating feet that so often follows my own parish Masses have made me know more and more what he meant.

By way of happy contrast let me take you to London, Ontario. We were going there first to stand reverently at the casket of a great Eucharistic priest, Rev. J. T. Maloney. The London paper that a grieving parishioner was good enough to send me lies on my table beside my typewriter. Fr. Maloney has gone home to God, to the welcome that the Christ of the Eucharist must surely have for a priest who loved the sacrament and did amazingly much to make Holy Communion grace-full and precious to his people.

It is more than a year since I was privileged to preach in his church as one of the priests who were invited for a novena of Eucharistic Sundays. I said Mass and helped give Holy Communion to a churchful of worshipers. Over the air I talked to the Londoners about the value of frequent Communion. I was the speaker that evening, when as part of that impressive novena the people once more gathered before the Blessed Sacrament upon the throne. And I sat in the sacristy while a priest religious invited from Boston led the people in the community Mass, explaining in a quiet voice each step that the priest at the altar was taking. Later I learned that he made the trip from Boston every Sunday for this purpose.

Yet of all the events of the day, the one that remains clearest and lingers most gratifyingly followed my own Mass. I had just fin-

ished the prayers at the end of Mass when Fr. Maloney, in surplice and stole, came to kneel at my side. Quietly, not a foot scraping in the church and not a cough breaking the wintry air, he led his people in a simple, beautiful thanksgiving after Holy Communion. With the congregation he made the act of faith in the presence of Christ in their hearts; he thanked the Eucharistic Saviour for the great climactic gift of this Communion, which was part of the long chain of blessings; he made a simple but effective act of love. He begged from the Saviour the graces his people needed as individuals and as citizens in a troubled age. He begged the Christ still present physically in the people to go out with them to their work, their home associations, their recreation, their march toward heaven.

Then he blessed himself, and his quiet entrance into the sacristy was no more reverent than the quiet exodus of his people from the church.

I was curious to know how long was the interval before the next Mass. I learned it was precisely what you would expect in any busy city parish—a matter of some ten minutes. But the people outside waited for those who had been making their thanksgiving together. It seemed to me—perhaps I exaggerate—that the people entering for the next Mass came with a little more than routine reverence. Perhaps devotion can be contagious.

The inspiring incident made me recall a rather venturesome step I had taken shortly after the headshaking of the priest I quoted earlier. I was saying Mass for a big convention in a cathedral in the northwest. I had preached at the Mass, helped give Holy Communion to the assembled conventioners, noted how those from the center aisles received and only a scattered few came from the side aisles, and then completed my Mass and said the prayers after Mass. Those prayers were terribly distracted. For I was torn between an impulse and a fear that my impulse would be smothered in an infantry charge: I wanted to make a thanksgiving with the jam-packed church. But would the many who had not received Holy Communion bolt?

I said the last "My Jesus, mercy." Then almost recklessly but as loud as I could I cried, "Thanksgiving after Holy Communion: 'O my Eucharistic God, I believe you are present in my heart. . . .'" The word "mercy" had almost been lost in the waves of sound that rose from scraping toes. But as I said the words "O my

Eucharistic God," the people in the jammed cathedral sank deep in silence. Whether the silence was amazement, partial frustration, wonder at the novelty, or co-operative devotion, I cannot from this distance say—nor do I particularly care. Even the parochial parasites, back near the holy-water fonts, did not move while for not more than seven minutes I made a complete thanksgiving with my conventioners and with those who surrounded them.

The pastor, a dignfied but somewhat bristling monsignor, was in the sacristy. Would he glare at me for holding up the routine of the carefully clocked Sunday? His brows gathered as he waited for me to bow to the sacristy crucifix. Then he said—high praise, believe me—"Good! I'm astonished that they stayed. But since they did, good!"

Since that time I have made the thanksgiving after Holy Communion with the most varied groups under the most varied circumstances.

Last summer I said Mass every morning for about a month in the chapel of the Grey Nuns in Midland, Ontario. Every morning we made our thanksgiving together. Those thanksgivings I am now writing into a booklet, which I hope will help nuns thank their very welcome but sometimes neglected Saviour; even nuns can at times be spiritually inarticulate.

In our Summer Schools of Catholic Action I have tried to make arrangements for a number of SSCA students to receive Holy Communion at my Mass each morning. After the Mass I make the thanksgiving along with them. Watchfully I note that the number who attend the first Mass increases steadily during the course of the week.

Once on the occasion of a priests' retreat I said the morning Mass at which the priests communicated, and I made the thanksgiving along with them. The silence of that priestly congregation was inspiring; I think I worked harder preparing those thanksgivings than I did preparing the more formal talks of the retreat.

Now whenever I say Mass for communicants in a school chapel, grammar school, high school, academy, or college, I make the thanksgiving along with them. I am quite frank to myself about my reason for doing it: I want to be sure that the thanksgiving is made, and I want to use the opportunity to teach them how a thanksgiving can be made simply.

For—coming once more to our devout and somewhat disillusioned old pastor—he was right in more than one apprehension. The youngster these days is prepared for his first Holy Communion at a time in his life that permits him only the sketchiest grounding. That is as it should be. For clearly the Church expected that the whole of the Catholic life would be a continuous growth in faith and practice: with the years the child would progress in his appreciation of the sacrament of the altar; and his reception of Holy Communion, far from becoming slack and monotonous, would develop into a lovely and inspiring personal contact and association.

The solemn Communion coming at a later date was given as a kind of next upward step in intelligent reception. That solemn Communion was preceded by fresh opportunity for instruction: what the soul receives; how the soul should receive it.

The parish devotions, the Sunday sermons, the parish retreats or missions were meant to be (and they often are) upward climbs, sound, wholesome spiritual growth. Indeed the whole attitude of the faithful toward Holy Communion was meant to be a developing and expanding appreciation and co-operation of a lifetime.

All that intention and hope of the Church with regard to Holy Communion places before priests and religious teachers an inspiring and challenging opportunity. We cannot possibly leave the people to their own spiritual devices; nor—with all possible reverence—must we expect the Christ in the tabernacle and in their hearts to do it all.

The tremendous reasons back of the Eucharist are the study of a lifetime. The ways in which Christ can be welcomed are limitless in their possibilities. Routine and dull monotony need never take the glow off Holy Communion, not if we who have the care of souls continue to remind the people of the glory of the Eucharist, the tender friendliness of the Christ who comes to them, and the importance on the part of all the faithful of using the moments after Holy Communion as effectively as possible.

Yet I do not think that the sermon or the classroom instruction can have near the effectiveness that comes of the actual making of the thanksgiving along with the faithful.

I have been urging upon teaching sisters the practice of making with the children thanksgiving after Holy Communion whenever the children receive together. If they can persuade the priest who

says the Mass to make the thanksgiving with them, they have the perfect combination.

I have seen the effect upon young people—from first-grade children to university graduate-school students—of the community Mass followed by a group thanksgiving. The whole magnificent unit gives them that vital sense of personal participation. They learn without the pain of learning. They pray under expert guidance. They glow with a sense of sudden facility in prayer.

The priest can talk directly to the Christ within him and make the talk so personal that it reaches the hearts that share his privilege of entertaining the Saviour. Sincerity and the personal touch need not be an "indirect sermon" in any but the most satisfactory sense.

When I have had the chance to discuss this with religious teachers, men and women, I have suggested that they themselves, kneeling in back of their youngsters, can well lead the thanksgiving.

Or—and I have tried this extremely satisfactory variant—they can appoint one of the youngsters to lead the thanksgiving. Beautiful liturgical thanksgivings are easily available. Why shouldn't the people participating in the royal priesthood that offers up the sacrifice say together the beautiful Psalms that the Church assigns to the priest for his formal act of gratitude to God? But beyond this there are simple thanksgivings that the young leader can read aloud while the rest follow with bent heads and closed eyes.

Thanksgiving after Holy Communion needs—like so much else that is obvious—someone to indicate its importance. We would all agree without discussion that thanksgiving is an essential part of a good Communion. But merely to point out the need is not necessarily to develop the practice.

I am simply amazed at the number of Catholics who never really make a thanksgiving after Holy Communion. The rush from the church is not so much an act of ungraciousness as it is a confession of weak faith and ignorance of devotion. People are sometimes exhorted to spend ten minutes (the minimal limit) with their Eucharistic Lord; but what they really need is someone to tell them *how* to spend the ten minutes—or even two minutes.

It would be worth a pastor's time to look at his congregation as they return to their pews after they have received Communion. There are those who because of habitual memory of what Sister Mary taught them in second grade bury their faces in their hands.

Some catch up their beads. Others reach at once for prayer book or missal. But the majority? A kind of dazed restlessness seems to take possession of them. They are like people with empty hands and empty minds. How strange the use of that word "empty" at the very moment when their souls are crowded with the living divine Presence!

After Communion the rest of the Mass flows swiftly over their heads—as do the distracting movements that accompany it. The prayers at the foot of the altar are answered far back in their throats, and the echo of the *Ite, missa est* releases them to instant flight.

But if a thousand Father Maloneys in a thousand churches and chapels were to steal after the communion ten—or seven, or five—minutes from the turnstile rush of the Mass schedule and in those few minutes lead the people in a quiet, impressive, and devotional thanksgiving . . .

If after Holy Communion the children were given the example and practice of the importance and relative simplicity of thanksgiving . . .

If nuns, the teachers and guides of our young people, were helped to a more effective personal thanksgiving in the certainty that they would pass the knowledge and practice along to their charges . . .

If the whole matter of the right use of those precious moments after Holy Communion became a pleasant preoccupation with a lot of us . . .

Would we need to bemoan the ineffectiveness of frequent Holy Communion or to berate our people for their thoughtless, too hasty rushing out of our churches?

If I may be almost too simply practical . . . I find that effective thanksgivings are easy to make with the people if we follow a few simple lines:

(1) I use the formula that Fr. Maloney used with his people, and I find it fundamental—a simple act of faith, an act of gratitude, an act of love, an act of petition, a request to the Saviour to "abide with us."

(2) The use of the thanksgiving for petition is obvious: gratitude for God's favors; the reminder that His generosity of the past is His guarantee of future gifts; the request for spiritual gifts for

ourselves; the request for spiritual gifts for others; the moment's silence while each asks for some pressing personal need.

(3) The people respond to an apostolic thanksgiving: they pause to recall the rejection of Christ by the world and the world's vast ignorance of Him; they remember the present labors of the missionaries; they ask for the conversion of sinners, light for the pagans, more saints for the world.

(4) The people like a thanksgiving that is made for their friends: petitions for relatives, for friends, for those who depend upon them, for those they may have wronged.

(5) I have used thanksgivings to initiate people in simple meditations, so that they make the thanksgiving a mental prayer in which they "contemplate" the Last Supper and take their place with the grateful disciples.

(6) It is easy to fit the thanksgiving into the spirit of the feast: a Christmas thanksgiving spent with the holy family in the stable; an Easter thanksgiving for the coming of the risen Christ; a Pentecost thanksgiving begging Christ to send to the world the fullness of the Holy Spirit.

(7) The people like to unite their thanksgiving with the Blessed Mother: a meditation on the spirit with which she welcomed Jesus in the Incarnation; a prayer to Christ for the grace to love Him as she loved Him.

(8) The thanksgiving can be a tie-in with life: offering to Christ the day ahead, being quite specific about activities and dangers; offering of the duties of one's state of life; praying against temptations during the day; looking forward to the meaning of life with Jesus; determining not to drive Him out of one's life.

It is of course easy to read thanksgivings quietly for the people. But I am convinced that the people prefer the thanksgiving, however hesitant and imperfectly worded, to come from the heart and mind of their priest. They are flattered when he makes his thanksgiving with them; they regard it as high compliment. They feel that they are having a part in his own private devotions. They get a sense of his understanding of their problems clearly enough to embody them in his prayers. And they are united with him in what seems and can well be a spontaneous burst of faith and love for the Christ who is the common bond of priest and people.

I have found it quite effective to make the thanksgiving tie in

with the sermon or talk at the Mass. Time was when sermons closed on a "colloquy," a little spontaneous prayer flowing from the sermon. This is now rather rare. But a substitute is the thanksgiving made to flow from what the priest taught the people in his talk. The context gives new value to his words and new meaning to their prayer.

All this is relatively simple for chaplains of convents and priests fortunate enough to say Mass in school chapels or the chapels of other Catholic institutions. Such a thanksgiving may sometimes actually serve as a variant on a sermon. When pressure of time has necessitated a choice, I have chosen the thanksgiving instead of the sermon.

The weekday Mass is a sweetly devotional time; and however eager or obligated the worshipers may be to get to their next duties, many of them will be glad of the extra five minutes that you take to help them with their thanksgiving.

Sunday Masses? Would it be a good thing if a little of the almost headlong plunge of the Sunday order were mitigated? I cannot believe that five minutes added to even the most rigidly organized schedule would be disastrous to the schedule. And from the point of view of the Eucharistic Saviour? . . . The corporate thanksgiving would be wonderful.

To fall back on truisms, people learn best by example. The personal thanksgivings made by the devout priest as he kneels, not in the sacristy, but in the sanctuary after his own Mass and Holy Communion are the subjects of real inspiration to the parishioners. Yet those thanksgivings do not teach people the *how* of thanksgiving. The *how* is best handled when the priest leads his people quietly, devoutly, meditatively . . . and they follow him, inspired by his example, instructed by the words that come from his heart.

DANIEL A. LORD, S.J.

St. Louis, Missouri

ARISTOTLE ON PERSUASION

There are . . . three means of effecting persuasion. The man who is to be in command of them must . . . be able to reason logically, to understand human character and goodness in their divers forms, and to understand the emotions.

—*Rhetoric*, I, 2.

THE PROBLEM OF OUR LADY'S COREDEMPTION

The preponderance with which Our Lady's Assumption has claimed the almost undivided attention of Mariologists in recent years has not in the least caused any neglect of the more fundamental doctrine of her coredemption. In fact, it would seem that the former has only served to accentuate theological reflection on the latter. Hence, the lively discussions on the nature and extent of Mary's share in the Saviour's redemptive work, far from showing any signs of waning, are rather gaining momentum.

Until a few years ago these polemics were limited, for the most part, to European magazines; but more recently they have been accorded hospitality by some of our leading American periodicals. This will redound to the greater profit of the average American reader who will now have an opportunity to evaluate the merits of the case as presented by the contending parties. Theological controversies, if conducted with calmness and sobriety, should have a healthy effect upon the human mind, helping to elucidate obscure issues and thus enrich the treasury of our knowledge. It is no mere coincidence that not a few among the greatest intellectual giants the world has ever known, were Catholic "controversialists." I believe it was the incomparable St. Augustine who once wrote: "Circulus et calamus fecerunt me doctorem." At any rate, it is an indisputable fact that the recent debates over Our Blessed Lady's coredemption have contributed considerably towards a better understanding of her exalted position in Catholic theology.

The purpose of this paper is neither to "prove" Mary's coredemption nor to solve systematically the various difficulties which would seem to militate against it. Our intention is simply to submit a few pertinent observations on a recent article by the eminent Professor A. Michel concerning this delicate problem.[1] The article was occasioned, so the author informs us, by a "remarkable essay" of Fr. Eugene Druwé, S.J., well-known professor of dogmatic theology at the Jesuit Theological Faculty of Louvain.[2]

[1] A. Michel, "Mary's Co-redemption," *AER,* CXXII, 3 (March, 1950), 183-92.

[2] E. Druwé, "La médiation universelle de Marie," in *Maria: Études sur la Sainte Vierge* (ed. H. du Manoir, S.J.), I (Paris, 1949), 419-572.

Dealing with this complex question, Professor Michel rightly distinguishes between the "word" coredemptrix and the "thing" signified by that term. This is as it should be; for even if the word coredemptrix were to be discarded as illegitimate, we could still adhere to the doctrine conveyed by it. Let us, then, treat both aspects of the question separately.

As regards the "word" coredemptrix, Professor Michel is of the opinion that it should be abandoned. Here is a summary of the reasons advanced: the term is a "novelty"; it seems "to divide the work of the Redemption into two parts"; it "suggests a *sameness* . . . between Mary's rôle and that of Christ"; it is subject to discussion because "it can cover an equivocation which is hard to clear up"; and besides, "it opens the door to a terminology unheard of until this day," such as co-mediation, co-merit, co-suffering, co-offering and similar expressions.[3]

To the objection that the word coredemptrix is a "novelty," one might reply that the newness of a word is not necessarily incompatible with its legitimacy, especially when it is used to express an old thought. If we are correctly informed, the term *transubstantiation* was not known until the twelfth century; yet that term, although new at that time, was accepted and employed to convey a definite doctrine and consecrated as such by the ecclesiastical authority. The term ὁμοούσιος presented a similar difficulty at the time of the Council of Nicaea. No one should question the right of the Magisterium to use a new word in order to express a given doctrine.

But is the word coredemptrix really a "novelty"? We do not think so. That word has been used in the Catholic Church *at least since the beginning of the fourteenth century.* We find it, for example, in an anonymous *Tractatus de praeservatione gloriosissimae Virginis Mariae,* written by a Franciscan theologian before the year 1323.[4] We have seen it also in the sermons of Alanus Varenius who lived around the year 1300.[5] It is interesting to note that, even at that early date, the author speaks of this title not as something in-

[3] *Art. cit.*, p. 184.

[4] Cf. J. B. Carol, *Doctrina de Beatae Virginis Corredemptione ab ortu usque ad prolapsum aetatis scholasticorum,* in *Miscellanea Francescana,* XLI (1941), 257 f.

[5] Some of these sermons have been edited by P. Alva y Astorga in the third volume of his *Bibliotheca virginalis Mariae mare magnum* (Matriti, 1648).

vented by himself, but rather as something that was already used by others; for immediately after the word coredemptrix he adds: "as they say."[6] In fact, in a liturgical book preserved with other manuscripts at St. Peter's in Salzburg and dating from the same period (14th century) the reader will come across the following:

Pia, dulcis et benigna,
Nullo prorsus luctu digna
Si fletum hinc eligeres
Ut compassa Redemptori,
Captivato transgressori
Tu Corredemptrix *fieres*[7]

Professor Michel goes on to say that the word coredemptrix seems to divide the work of the Redemption into two parts, suggesting a *sameness* between Mary's rôle and that of Christ. Strangely enough, the title suggests nothing of the kind either to the Magisterium or to the countless theologians and Catholic writers who have been using it for the last seven hundred years. Nor is there any reason why it should. The prefix "co" does not place the Blessed Virgin on an equal footing with Christ, as Professor Michel contends. That prefix is the direct equivalent of the Latin "cum," which means "with" and not "equal." Thus a "*co*-operator" is one who worked *with* another; whether or not they both have an equal share in the work is not indicated by the "co" at all. Besides, if the meaning of "co" is *equal,* what then is the meaning of the word "co-equal"?

St. Paul writes to the Corinthians: "For we are God's coadjutors" (*I Cor.* 3:9). Does he thereby place himself and the Apostles on an equal footing with God in the work of sanctifying souls? Not at all. Only a few verses before, he explains that God's share in that work is absolutely primary and essential while theirs is

[6] Cf. Alva y Astorga, *Bibliotheca* . . . , III, 525, col. 2.

[7] For this quotation we are indebted to Fr. Serapio de Iragui, O.F.M.Cap., *La Mediación de la Virgen en la himnografía latina de la edad media* (Buenos Aires, 1939), p. 173. The term "Redemptrix" dates from an even earlier period. Thus, a litany found in a manuscript psalter of the tenth century, now kept at the library of the Chapter of Salisbury, contains such invocations as these: "Sancta Salvatrix mundi, ora pro nobis; Sancta *Redemptrix* mundi, ora pro nobis." Cf. "The Liturgy and the Ritual of the Anglo-Saxon Church," *The Church Quarterly Review,* XIV (1885), 291.

merely secondary and non-essential. He says: "I have planted, Apollo watered, but God gave the increase. Therefore, *neither he that planteth is anything nor he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase*" (vv. 6-7). Besides, if we are asked to discard the word coredemptrix on the pretext that it implies a "*sameness* between Mary's role and that of Christ," why not discard also the age-old expression "co-operatrix Redemptionis" which is fully endorsed even by the most resolute opponents of Mary's coredemption? Would not the prefix "co" in that expression "divide the work of Redemption into two parts" and imply "a *sameness* between Mary's rôle and that of Christ"?

As to the charge that the term coredemptrix is ambiguous and conceals an equivocation, we answer that it is not the task of any private theologian to check up on the terminology used in Papal documents. These are always meticulously worded and deserve our utmost respect. The Holy See tells us that it is a praiseworthy custom to style Mary "coredemptrix";[8] it has indulgenced a prayer in which the sinner exalts her prerogative as "coredemptrix" of mankind;[9] it has extended to the whole world, as a double of the second class, the feast of Mary's Sorrows "in order that the love and the sentiments of gratitude of the faithful may be more and more enkindled toward the merciful coredemptrix of the human race."[10] And Pope Pius XI, in the world-wide radio broadcast with which he solemnly closed the Jubilee of our Redemption, thus addressed the Mother of God: "O Mother of love and mercy who didst stand next to thy dearest Son as He was consummating the Redemption of the human race on the altar of the Cross, suffering with Him *as a coredemptrix*. . . ."[11] The same Pope bestowed this title on Our Blessed Mother on at least five other occasions.[12]

Let us bear in mind that the Church has a perfect right to choose the terminology she deems suitable to express a given doctrine or thought. She has exercised that right, for example, adopting the words ὁμοούσιος, θεοτόκος, transubstantiation, infallibility and others.

[8] Cf. *AAS*, V (1913), 364.

[9] Cf. *AAS*, VI (1914), 108.

[10] Cf. *ASS*, XLI (1908), 409.

[11] Cf. *L'Osservatore romano*, April 29-30, 1935, p. 1.

[12] Cf. G. M. Roschini, "La Madonna nel pensiero e nell'insegnamento di Pio XI," *Marianum*, I (1939), 121-72, esp. 164.

These words do not mean what any private individual may fancy, but whatever the Church wants, and no more. Something similar may be said of the word coredemptrix. Catholic theologians and spiritual writers have for several centuries availed themselves of it in order to express Mary's secondary and subordinate share in the work of our Redemption.[13] The Bishops throughout the world frequently use it in that restricted sense.[14] Finally, the Holy See has sanctioned it by inserting it in its documents and decrees. Co-redemption, therefore, does not mean what Protestants or even individual Catholics may fancy, but solely and exclusively what Catholic theology, as a whole, may wish to signify by it. This being so, the word coredemptrix is by no means ambiguous and misleading; it conveys the idea of a secondary and totally subordinate co-operation in the redemptive work of Christ.

Another fear expressed by Professor Michel is that the word coredemptrix "opens the door to a terminology unheard of until this day": co-mediation, co-merit, co-suffering, co-offering . . . etc. Even if this were true, it would hardly militate against the use of the title in question. As Fr. Druwé pertinently points out in the same article attacked by Michel, "when languages are concerned, usage is the only law."[15] Perhaps some of the compound words mentioned above do sound somewhat strange and even harsh to some ears, but they may eventually be sanctioned by frequent and universal use, and if so, they will no longer sound harsh and strange.

A propos of this question, the eminent Scripture scholar, J. M. Bover, S.J., points out that St. Paul himself was particularly fond of expressing our intimate union with Christ by means of similar compound words. Among such terms employed by the Apostle of the Gentiles we find, in the Latin version: *com*pati, *con*figi cruci, *com*mori, *con*sepeliri, *con*resuscitari, *con*vivere, *con*vivificari, *con*figurari, *con*glorificari, *con*sedere, *con*regnare, *con*formis, *com*plan-

[13] Cf. J. B. Carol, "Our Lady's Part in the Redemption according to Seventeenth Century Writers," *Franciscan Studies* (new series), III (1943), 3-20; 143-58. *Id.*, "Testimonia saeculi XVIII de Beata Virgine Corredemptrice," *Marianum*, IX (1947), 37-63. *Id.*, "Mary's Co-redemption according to Nineteenth Century Italian Writers," *Marianum*, XI (1949), 407-22.

[14] Cf. J. B. Carol, "Episcoporum doctrina de Beata Virgine Corredemptrice," *Marianum*, X (1948), 210-58.

[15] E. Druwé, *art. cit.*, p. 428.

tatus, *co*heredes, *com*particeps, *con*corporalis, *co*-aedificari.[16] If it was perfectly legitimate for the Apostle to say that we Christians must cosuffer with Christ in order to coreign with Him and become coheirs of the kingdom of God, then it should be equally legitimate for the Holy See and for us to employ similar compound expressions in order to emphasize the intimate union between Christ and Mary in the work of our Redemption.

Professor Michel asks an important question: "But is there not some ground for fear that the Catholic apologetic will thus lose some of its force, by reason of the confusions that such expressions engender in some minds less enlightened or even merely prejudiced? We think particularly of our separated brethren, the Protestants."[17] This question contains a kind of implication which used to impress more than one Catholic writer. It is the same everlasting recourse to: "what will the Protestants say?" History shows that it has been cleverly exploited (obviously to no avail) every time it was rumored that the Church was about to define some Marian doctrine. Having been tried so often, the argument has by now become somewhat stale. Nevertheless, it deserves to be examined more closely.

Professor Michel fears that the title coredemptrix will engender confusion in the minds of those who are "less enlightened or even merely prejudiced." If so, it would seem that the duty of the Catholic apologist should be to instruct such people so as to make them more enlightened and less prejudiced. If ignorance and prejudice are the cause of the so-called confusion, then the sensible solution will be, not to discard the title, but rather to remove the ignorance and the prejudice by means of an adequate explanation of the term.

As to the fear that Protestants will be more confirmed in their opposition to Catholic doctrine and thus the possibility of reunion with Rome will be more remote, one could perhaps point out that the Holy See and the hundreds of Bishops and theologians who use that title are just as keenly interested in the prompt return of Protestants to the fold as anyone else. Thus, for example, in 1943 the Bishops of Holland, whose zeal for the conversion of Protestants is well known to all, issued a pastoral letter emphatically vindicating both the title and the doctrine of Mary's coredemp-

[16] Cf. J. M. Bover, "B. V. Maria, hominum Co-redemptrix," *Gregorianum*, VI (1925), 542.

[17] *Art. cit.*, p. 185.

tion.[18] England, another predominantly Protestant country, furnishes us with an even more striking example: the memorable letter written by Cardinal Manning on the occasion of Fr. Jeanjacquot's book on Mary's coredemption. In that letter the distinguished prince of the Church solemnly protests against the pretentions of those who wish to deprive the Blessed Mother of God of this beautiful title. He writes that

> [The book] has come to us in England at a mighty opportune time, as a perfect refutation of the pretentious criticisms of certain writers who, lacking elementary knowledge, condemn the practices of devotion and the pious beliefs of the Church. There is nothing easier than to have a profound and a superficial mind at one and the same time; to be saturated with an indigested erudition and incapable of understanding the first principles of the faith. Such is, to a very large extent, the state of some individuals who, while professing belief in the Incarnation of the Divine Word, refuse to style Mary Mother of God, and who raise their voice against the titles of coredemptrix, co-operatrix, reparatrix and mediatrix, after having misconstrued their meaning. The presumptuous audacity with which the language and the devotions not only of ordinary Catholics, but also of the Saints, have been censured by such authors, may have caused momentary alarm in some humble and timid souls. It is, therefore, very opportune to place in their hands this excellent translation of a work which proves in a truly solid, clear and irrefutable manner, that, owing to the Word's Incarnation, Our Blessed Mother has received from her divine Son a true right to all these titles. Hence, these titles which we give her are not metaphors but truths; they are not the expression of purely oratorical or poetical ideas, but the expression of true and living relations existing between her and her divine Son, between her and us.[19]

Furthermore, the annals of the Church, corroborated by our personal experience, testify to the fact that there is hardly any point of Catholic teaching which has not been misunderstood by our "separated brethren" and even by not a few "less enlightened"

[18] Cf. J. Bittremieux, "La mariologie de 1942 à 1945," *Marianum*, IX (1947), 12 f. and 31 f., where excerpts of that Pastoral Letter are given in French.

[19] This letter forms the preface to the second (English) edition of Fr. P. Jeanjacquot's book *Simples explications sur la coopération de la très sainte Vierge à l'oeuvre de la Rédemption*. Since we do not have that edition, we have translated the letter literally from the third (French) edition (Paris, 1889), pp. VIII f.

Catholics. What has been the traditional policy, the invariable attitude of the Church under the circumstances? Has she ever abandoned her doctrines and terminology so as not to "engender confusion"? Certainly not. She has explained her teaching, her terminology, and fearlessly adhered to them.

Moreover, if the title coredemptrix be avoided on the pretext that it "confuses" Protestants and retards their reunion with Rome, should we not be consistent with ourselves and avoid likewise hundreds of doctrines and titles which have, as a matter of fact, been the occasion of misunderstanding and even scandal on the part of our "separated brethren"? Why not discontinue using the expression *mediatrix omnium gratiarum*, which, in their estimation, undermines the scriptural teaching concerning the one Mediator between God and man? Why not abstain from the expression "papal infallibility," which, according to them, renders the Pope impeccable and free from error in whatever he says or does?

We mentioned above that the Church is very careful not to use or sanction any terminology which may be in itself and objectively ambiguous or misleading. This solicitude of the Church was evidenced a few years ago in connection with the title "Priestess," which some Catholic used to bestow on the Blessed Virgin. That word could be understood—and it was actually understood by Catholic theologians—in a very sound and correct sense. And yet, in order to forestall possible misconceptions and abuses, the Holy Office rightly issued a warning against it in 1916 and again in 1927.[20] Unfortunately, there are still not a few pious writers, particularly in Professor Michel's native land, who insist on using that word, notwithstanding the wise admonition of the Holy See. At any rate, this same Holy See, ever solicitous to preserve the purity of our faith, has not seen fit to warn us against the title coredemptrix, but has, on the contrary, sanctioned it on repeated occasions.

So much have we felt bound to say in defense of this beautiful and universally accepted title of Our Most Blessed Mother. We have little or no fear that Professor Michel's efforts to deprive her

[20] Cf. *AAS*, VIII (1916), 146, and again *Palestra del Clero*, VI (1927), 611. On the various interpretations of these decisions, consult René Laurentin, "Le problème du sacerdoce marial devant le magistère," *Marianum*, X (1948), 160-78.

of it will find a sympathetic echo among our American readers. The title coredemptrix is here to stay. Catholic theology is inexorable on this point, and the good professor might just as well be resigned to this fact.

Let us now turn our attention to the "doctrine" conveyed by the term, namely, the intimate share of the Blessed Virgin in the work of Christ's Redemption. Naturally, in order to understand this doctrine, it is imperative that we have very clear and exact notions as to (a) what constitutes Christ's Redemption; and (b) the manner in which Mary may be said to share in it.

In Catholic theology the term "Redemption" designates the sum total of meritorious and satisfactory acts performed by Christ while on earth, offered to the Eternal Father *per modum unius* with His sacrifice on the Cross, in virtue of which the Eternal Father was moved (humanly speaking) to re-instate the human race, lost by sin, into His former friendship. This complex idea of Redemption may, of course, be expressed in a variety of ways, as for example, by saying that Christ "reconciled us with the Father," that He "expiated our sins," that He was "immolated for our salvation," that He "acquired for us all the graces necessary for our salvation," that He "paid the price of our Redemption," etc. By these and similar expressions we are not adding any new or different elements to the above definition; we are simply emphasizing various aspects of a complex reality. For example, when we speak of the Blood of the Saviour as the "price" which He paid for our ransom, we are only using a metaphor; that "price" was actually constituted by the merits and satisfactions which He offered for our Redemption.

When explaining Mary's share in Christ's Redemption, theologians generally distinguish a twofold co-operation, namely, remote (or indirect) and proximate (or direct). She co-operated *remotely,* for example, by meriting some of the circumstances of the Incarnation, and particularly by giving birth to the world's Redeemer.[21] She co-operated proximately by suffering with Him, by

[21] This co-operation was not merely physical and material, as most Protestants imagine, but also moral and formal; Mary knowingly and willingly consented to become the Mother of the *Redeemer.* This fact has led some to call this co-operation *proximate* and *direct.* Cf. J. M. Bover, "Concepto integral de la maternidad divina según los Padres de Efeso," *Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia,* VII (1931), 155 ff. *Id., Mediación de Madre, o la mediación universal como actuación de la maternidad de María* (Covadonga, 1927), pp. 32 ff.

offering Him on Calvary for our salvation. According to Catholic theology, Mary's compassion and oblation had a meritorious and satisfactory value in the sight of God, and they were joined with the merits and satisfactions of Christ to produce or bring about the selfsame effect, namely, the Redemption of mankind. The difference between the two lies in this, that while Christ's merits and satisfactions had an infinite value in themselves and moved God *de condigno* and *ex rigore justitiae,* Our Blessed Lady's merits and satisfactions drew all their value from those of Christ, were totally subordinate to the latter, and moved God *de congruo, ex divina benevolentia.*[22] Before going any further, let us state quite frankly that we believe this to be the *doctrina communissima* in the Catholic Church, at least at the present time.

Until a few years ago, whenever a theologian or Catholic writer stated that "Mary was our coredemptrix because she had co-operated in Christ's Redemption by means of her meritorious compassion, oblation etc. etc.," it was generally taken for granted that such authors were using the word "Redemption" in the sense explained above, namely, the acts by which Christ atoned for our sins, reconciled us to the Father and acquired for us all the graces necessary for salvation. So much so that, by synecdoche, the work of Christ's Redemption was often identified with "the acquisition of graces." Hence, the generally accepted thesis was formulated thus: Mary is our coredemptrix, not because she has a share in the application of the Redemption (this she does as dispenser of all graces), but precisely because she had co-operated with Christ in their acquisition. Whether this terminology (acquisition-application) was adequate and happily chosen or not, may be open to question. But the point is that we all knew what was meant by that terminology.

Then in the early 30's came Professor H. Lennerz, of the Gregorian University in Rome, with a revolutionary "discovery." He suggested a different terminology which, in his opinion, was the only one capable of clarifying the whole issue of Mary's share in

[22] According to several good theologians, Mary's merit was not only *de congruo,* but *de condigno ex mera condignitate.* This opinion, which is based on solid grounds, seems to be gaining more favor at the present time.

the work of Redemption.[23] Since Professor Michel's objections are based in great measure on the terminology used by Lennerz, we must here concentrate our attention on the latter.

According to the noted German theologian, the distinction between the "acquisition of graces" and their "application" was both inadequate and equivocal. He proposed, instead, the distinction between "objective" Redemption and "subjective" Redemption. The former was accomplished when God, accepting the merits and satisfactions of Christ, *per modum unius* with His sacrificial death on the Cross, ceased to be angry at the human race and showed Himself ready to reinstate fallen man into His former friendship. (The reader will note that this coincides perfectly with our definition of "Redemption" pure and simple, as given above). The latter, i.e. the subjective Redemption, takes place when Christ's merits and satisfactions are actually applied to individual souls through the normal means established by God (sacraments, prayer, etc.). Having introduced the above distinction, Professor Lennerz goes on to say that what theologians used to designate as a co-operation in the "acquisition of grace" does not necessarily imply a co-operation in the objective Redemption; for such an acquisition of graces may also be had in the order of subjective Redemption.[24] Hence, the testimonies mentioned above must be discarded as insufficient to prove the doctrine of Mary's coredemption *sensu proprio*.[25]

In our humble opinion, the terminology suggested by Lennerz, instead of clarifying the issue, would seem to create a greater confusion. What the author calls "subjective" Redemption is not really and properly a Redemption, but rather an effect, a sequel, a corol-

[23] Cf. H. Lennerz, *De Beata Virgine*, 2nd ed. (Rome, 1935), pp. 112 f.; 3rd ed. (Rome, 1939), pp. 111-20. *Id.* "Considerationes de doctrina B. Virginis mediatricis, *Gregorianum*, XIX (1938), 419-44; *Id.* "De cooperatione B. Virginis in ipso opere redemptionis," *Gregorianum*, XXVIII (1947), 574-97; XXIX (1948), 118-41. This last article was written against C. Dillenschneider's excellent book *Marie au service de notre Rédemption* (Haguenau, 1947). Fr. Dillenschneider has recently answered Lennerz's objections in a lengthy article "Pour une corédemption mariale bien comprise," *Marianum*, XI (1949), 121-258.

[24] Cf. Lennerz, *De Beata Virgine*, 3rd ed., pp. 117 ff., 216-37. See also his article against Dillenschneider, referred to above.

[25] Coredemption *sensu proprio* is a shorter way of saying that Mary cooperated proximately and directly in the *objective* Redemption.

lary of the one Redemption already accomplished, brought to a close on Calvary. It is, in other words, not the Redemption itself, but rather the application of its fruits to individual souls. This being so, it may be asked: if Mary's co-operation in the subjective Redemption is sufficient reason to style her coredemptrix, why should not all priests have a right to be called "coredeemers" in the same sense as Mary? Do we not, in our priestly ministry, co-operate actively and proximately in the work of subjective Redemption? In fact, why are not all the faithful "coredeemers" in the same sense as Mary? Do not the faithful actually merit the application of Christ's merits when they offer the value of their good works for the salvation of others?

It is true that the word Redemption is sometimes used in Catholic theology in the exclusive sense of "*applying* the merits of Christ." But this is obviously a metaphor in which the term Redemption loses its proper meaning and takes on a "transferred" sense. This usage is, of course, quite legitimate, provided we abide by the standard laws of hermeneutics governing the use of analogous terms. According to these, it would be illegitimate to conclude *a priori* that whenever tradition speaks of Mary as co-operating in the Redemption, this latter term must be interpreted *sensu translato*. After all, is it not a universally accepted rule that, unless there are solid reasons to the contrary, *analogum, per se sumptum, stat pro famosiori analogato?*[26]

For this very reason, even if Fr. Lennerz' terminology were adequate in itself, we would still object to its being set up as the only criterion for the interpretation of texts, particularly those which were formulated before his terminology became common. And this is exactly what Fr. Lennerz and some of his followers have been doing for the last ten or fifteen years. What has been the result of this unscientific method? That a multitude of texts in which Mary was proclaimed as our coredemptrix because of her share in the acquisition of graces have been arbitrarily discarded by these au-

[26] Cf. J. M. Bover, "Cooperatio remota in ordine physico ad objectivam redemptionem," *Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia*, XIII (1940), 1-41, where the author shows the illegitimacy of Lennerz's method of interpretation. Cf. also on this same subject: G. M. Roschini, "Equivoci sulla corredenzione," *Marianum* X (1948), 277-82; C. Dillenschneider, *Marie au service de notre Rédemption* (Haguenau, 1947), pp. 5-11; B. H. Merkelbach, *Mariologia* (Paris, 1939), pp. 322 f.

thors as "insufficient" to prove the doctrine of coredemption *sensu proprio.*

This being so, why should we be surprised that not a few theologians have seen in Fr. Lennerz's terminology a concealed effort to distort and explain away even the clearest testimonies in favor of that doctrine?[27] This is a daring accusation, to be sure. But *contra factum non valet argumentum.* Let us take, as a typical example, the significant statement made by Cardinal Pacelli (now Pius XII, gloriously reigning) in a sermon preached in Rome on Dec. 7, 1937: "After all, the application of the merits of Christ constitutes, together with their acquisition, a single, complete work: that of salvation. It was fitting that Mary should co-operate equally in the two phases of the same work; the unity of the divine plan demands it."[28] Since the Cardinal states that the acquisition and application of Christ's merits constitute the complete work of Redemption, he must be including what Fr. Lennerz calls objective Redemption. But this objective Redemption cannot be identified with the application of merits. Therefore, it must be identified with their acquisition. This is, of course, the obvious sense intended by the Cardinal, as any unprejudiced mind can readily perceive. And yet, according to Fr. Lennerz's distinction, the Cardinal's statement does not necessarily imply anything beyond Mary's co-operation in the subjective Redemption![29] To add ambiguity to equivocation, the advocates of this distinction sometimes forget themselves and explicitly identify the subjective Redemption with the sole application of the merits of Christ.[30] In so doing,

[27] Cf. N. Garcia Garcés, "Orientaciónes mariológicas, o los estudios marianos en nuestros dias," *Estudios Marianos,* I (Madrid, 1942), 377; J. M. Bover, *art. cit., Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia,* p. 5.

[28] Cf. *L'Osservatore romano,* Dec. 8, 1937, p. 3.

[29] In the same sermon (*ibid.,* p. 4) the Cardinal says that, at the hour of our death, Christ seems to speak to each of us as follows: "It is my wish that just as she [Mary] co-operated in my *Redemption,* she may also co-operate in the application of the graces which are the fruit thereof." Interpret the word "Redemption" as referring to the *subjective* Redemption, and see if you can make any sense out of these words.

[30] Cf. Lennerz, *De Beata Virgine,* 3rd ed., p. 117, and also in his article in *Gregorianum,* XIX (1938), 430. Cf. W. Goossens, *De cooperatione immediata Matris Redemptoris ad redemptionem objectivam* (Paris, 1939), pp. 137, 157.

they unwittingly reveal the true purpose of their distinction and terminology.

After this unfavorable appraisal, the reader will no doubt wonder why we ourselves have adopted Fr. Lennerz's terminology in the course of the various articles written since 1938. We have done so for a very practical reason, namely, in order to be understood by the adversaries of Mary's coredemption. This is the procedure followed by a good number of theologians at the present time. We might perhaps go so far as to endorse the said terminology, *provided it is not used as the sole criterion in the interpretation of texts* and against the most elementary laws of hermeneutics. In what other field of human knowledge is it permissible to set up a mechanical "yardstick" of our own in order to measure things which followed an entirely different pattern? What right have we to interpret documents of the past according to a highly technical terminology which has become popular only within recent years and which, in fact, is not accepted by all even now? To these questions the advocates of this method will reply: it is not necessary that the testimonies of the past or even those of recent Popes explicitly use the expression "objective Redemption"; it suffices that they convey the sense underlying that expression.

But this concession is granted only in theory; in practice, whenever it creates an embarrassing situation, it is very conveniently ignored. Let us see it. The sense of objective Redemption is (according to them and to us) that Our Blessed Lord, through His merits and satisfactions, appeased the wrath of God and thus restored the human race to the friendship of God. Now let us suppose that we find a testimony of an eighteenth century theologian formulated something like this: "Mary is our coredemptrix because, together with Christ, she merited our salvation, satisfied for our sins, appeased the wrath of God, reconciled us to the Father, etc. etc." What will the adversaries answer to this? Will they agree that the aforesaid testimony conveys the idea of objective coredemption? Here is what they will tell you: since Mary was herself redeemed and could not co-operate directly in the objective Redemption, and since meriting, satisfying, appeasing the wrath of God and reconciling men to God can also take place in the sphere of subjective Redemption, the above testimony cannot be understood of

Mary's objective coredemption.[31] Incredible? It surely is. But read and re-read Fr. Lennerz's, Goossens' and Michel's publications and you will see that the sum and substance of their reasoning amounts to just that.[32]

This is not all. Let us suppose that, at long last, we can produce a text in which Mary's co-operation in the objective Redemption is so clearly formulated that it would be ridiculous to deny it. What then? Capitulate? Nonsense! Listen to Professor Michel:

> The theologians discuss the exact meaning of the pontifical texts in such detail as to lose sight of the basic question. . . . The question is not to learn whether Mary was intimately united to Christ by a moral union in those acts by which He immediately brought about the objective Redemption, particularly His Passion and death. Nor is the question whether or not the Virgin has made satisfaction or has merited for men. The only question is to ascertain whether or not the Compassion of God's Mother, her satisfactory and meritorious acts, have contributed *directly*, to some extent, to produce those effects which we designate by the expression "objective Redemption." [33]

Further on Professor Michel reminds us again: "All theologians agree in admitting in Mary a real [though indirect] participation in the objective Redemption. The only possible controversy is concerned with the *immediate and direct character* of this participation."[34] In other words, to be valid, papal testimonies adduced in favor of Mary's coredemption *sensu proprio* must make it clear, not only that the Pope has the objective Redemption in mind, but also (the *basic* question!) that he is speaking of an *immediate and direct* co-operation. Otherwise, his words will be understood of an indirect and mediate co-operation.

This being so, it is imperative that we ascertain exactly what these men understand by "mediate or remote" and "immediate

[31] Cf. Lennerz, *De Beata Virgine*, 3rd ed., pp. 116 ff., 220 f.; *Id., art. cit., Gregorianum*, XIX (1938), 430. W. Goossens, *op. cit.*, passim, especially p. 16. Michel, *art. cit.*, pp. 186 ff.

[32] Cf. J. B. Carol, "Pater H. Lennerz et problema de corredemptione, *Marianum*, II (1940), 194-200.

[33] Cf. Michel, *art. cit.*, p. 186, making his own the objection of Goossens.

[34] *Art. cit.*, p. 190.

or proximate."[35] Since Professor Michel does not elaborate on this point, we will have recourse to Fr. Lennerz, on whom all the adversaries of Mary's coredemption depend almost entirely. According to Fr. Lennerz, a *mediate* co-operation in the objective Redemption is that which precedes the redemptive act itself, is ordained and leads up to it, such as, for example, meriting some circumstance of the Incarnation, knowingly consenting to become the Mother of the Redeemer, nourishing the Victim, and similar acts. An *immediate* or proximate co-operation would be had[36] if Mary determined Christ (by means of requests, counsel, command, etc.) to perform His redemptive act. Or again, if the merits and satisfactions of Mary were joined with those of Christ (not to enhance them, of course, but by a free disposition of God) in such a way that the objective Redemption would be brought about in virtue of the merits and satisfactions of Christ *and* of Mary.[37]

Bearing these definitions and distinctions in mind, let us now try to apply them to a concrete case. The well-known passage of Pope Benedict XV in the Apostolic Letter *Inter sodalicia* (March 22, 1918) would seem to be particularly appropriate for the test. The Holy Father writes:

> The fact that the Sorrowful Mother has been chosen and is invoked as the patroness of a happy death not only blends admirably with Catholic teaching and the pious belief of the Church, but is also based on a hope which we rightly and happily nourish. In fact, the Doctors of the Church generally teach that if the Blessed Virgin Mary—who seemed to be absent from Christ's public life—was close to Him as He was about to die nailed to the Cross, this was due to a disposition of God. That is to say, she suffered and almost died together with her suffering and dying Son, she abdicated her maternal rights over her Son for the salvation of men and, in so far as it was within her power, *she immolated her Son in order to appease the justice of God, in such*

---

[35] We have shown elsewhere that these two terms are not necessarily synonymous. However, since they are generally used as such in the coredemption controversy, we do not think it necessary to point out the difference at every turn. Cf. on this B. H. Merkelbach, *Mariologia* (Paris, 1939), p. 340.

[36] Needless to say, we are now considering co-operation in the *moral* order. There is no controversy over the physical order.

[37] Cf. Lennerz, *De Beata Virgine*, 3rd ed., pp. 115 f.

a manner that we may rightly say that she redeemed the human race together with Christ.[38]

That the Pope is here speaking of Mary's share in the objective Redemption (that is to say, in the Redemption itself, and not merely in the application of its effects) is so evident that even Professor Goossens readily admits it.[39] But is the Pope speaking of a remote (mediate) or rather of a proximate (immediate) co-operation?

The adversaries of Mary's coredemption claim that the Pope's words do not exceed a remote and mediate co-operation. But how is this possible? They seem to forget that, according to their own definition, a mediate and remote co-operation is that which precedes the Redemption itself and only leads up to it, such as giving birth to the Redeemer, nourishing the Victim etc. Does the Pope mention any of these acts in the above text? He does not so much as allude to them! According to Benedict XV, the concrete and specific manner in which Mary coredeemed the world consisted in her intimate share in the sufferings of the Saviour, in the abdication of her maternal rights over His human life, in the act of immolating her own Son; and all this—note well—*in order to appease the wrath of God together with Christ.* Are we not, therefore, amply justified in considering this papal pronouncement as a clear statement of Mary's coredemption *sensu proprio?* At any rate, it so happens that this is also the interpretation proposed by the majority of theologians and Catholic writers. Does this not arouse a strong suspicion that such is the *obvious* meaning of the passage? The adversaries do not think so. They feel that the Pope could have expressed himself more clearly. How correct Suarez was when he wrote: "Haec est humana conditio, ut vix possit homo tam perspicuis verbis sensum suum explicare, quin ambiguitates et dubia nascantur."[40]

Professor Sylvester O'Brien, O.F.M., a champion of Mary's coredemption, once asked the adversaries of the doctrine "to suggest by what language and expression, other than those used, the Popes could have expressed, if they wished to do so, the immediate co-

[38] Cf. *AAS,* X (1918), 181 f.

[39] Goossens, *op. cit.,* pp. 71 f.

[40] Suarez, *De legibus,* lib. 6, cap. 1, n. 5 (*Opera omnia,* ed. Vivès, VI, 3, col. 1).

operation of Mary in purchasing the fruits of the Redemption."[41] We ourselves have repeatedly asked the same question; but, to our knowledge, it has not yet been answered. Could it be that the question is somewhat embarrassing and should, therefore, be conveniently ignored?

Towards the end of his article Professor Michel draws the readers' attention to a distinction introduced by Billot between the Redemption itself and the Redemption "realized more perfectly"; in other words, between the *esse simpliciter Redemptionis* and the *melius esse Redemptionis*. The distinction has impressed Michel as being "very useful" in solving the problem of Mary's coredemption.[42] Let us see.

According to Billot, the *esse simpliciter Redemptionis* is the payment of a proportionate satisfaction for the sins of mankind. In this Mary had no part. The *melius esse Redemptionis* is that accidental perfection added to the work of Christ so that men may be more aptly recalled to the end of eternal life; a certain "sweetness" that follows from the fact that a mother intervenes in the divine economy of salvation to *dispense* the merits of the Cross.[43]

In our humble opinion, this new distinction, far from being "very useful" in solving the problem, only increases the confusion. In reality, the *melius esse Redemptionis* of Billot is nothing else but the *Redemptio subjectiva* of Fr. Lennerz, with a poetic touch of sentimentality and "sweetness" added to it to make it more palatable. If so, to restrict Mary's co-operation to the so-called *melius esse Redemptionis* is equivalent to saying that she did not co-operate in the Redemption at all, but only in the *application* of its fruits to individual souls. Why multiply distinctions and terminology to say practically the same thing? To be sure, we are all eternally grateful to Almighty God for having introduced a Mother in the divine economy of salvation. No Catholic can possibly fail to experience the delightful sweetness created by her presence there. But we maintain that this is only an "accidental" element in the process of our salvation and should not be allowed to distract the theologian from the consideration of the real issue involved.

[41] S. O'Brien, "Recent Popes and the Doctrine of the Mediation of Mary," *The Clergy Review*, XII (1942), 105.

[42] Michel, *art. cit.*, p. 191.

[43] Billot, *De Verbo Incarnato* (Rome, 1912), p. 400.

Professor Michel continues: "Those who favor a *moral and mediate* participation can, it would seem . . . more easily conciliate the functions of Jesus and of Mary, the Passion and the Com-Passion, the Redemption and the Co-Redemption, in the sense in which this latter term is acceptable."[44] Very true. And so could the theologians of old "more easily" conciliate Catholic dogmas . . . by denying Mary's Immaculate Conception!

The concluding paragraph of Professor Michel's article contains a statement which calls for a comment. Speaking of the upholders of Mary's coredemption *sensu proprio* and their adversaries, he says: "Basically, perhaps, only a dispute about words separates the first group from the second."[45] Nothing could be farther from the truth. The most superficial reader, by simply bearing in mind the definitions and distinctions introduced by Lennerz, Goossens and Michel, will be convinced of this: the difference between the thesis championed by the first group and that defended by the second is exactly the same as the difference existing between a true coredemption and no coredemption at all. Naturally, none of the adversaries will admit this. But whether they admit it or not, they bestow the title coredemptrix on the Blessed Mother *in exactly the same sense* in which that term applies to all the faithful, although in a higher degree. Hence, to claim that we are merely arguing about "words," is to have missed completely the real issues involved.

One further observation. It is at times remarked that, if the doctrine of Mary's coredemption *sensu proprio* rests on such solid grounds, it is difficult to understand why so many eminent theologians have consistently opposed it. The group includes such names as Billot, M. de la Taille, H. Lennerz, W. Goossens, J. Rivière, G. D. Smith, etc. We answer: (a) All these men are unquestionably eminent theologians and we would be the last on earth to minimize their learning and their ability in the field of the sacred sciences. But does their learning exceed that of the "Giants of Scholasticism" who were consistently opposed to Mary's Immaculate Conception? It is permissible to doubt it. (b) If the controversy is going to be decided by the number of theologians (eminent and otherwise) who have expressed their views in this connection, then we are surely on the winning side. Fortunately, even

[44] Michel, *art. cit.*, p. 192.
[45] *Ibid.*

the adversaries agree with us on this point[46] and hence we may be dispensed from any further elaboration on this matter at the present time.[47]

J. B. Carol, O.F.M.

Holy Name College
Washington, D. C.

[46] Goossens, *op. cit.*, p. 16; G. D. Smith, "Method in Mariology," *The Clergy Review*, XVII (1939), 499 f.

[47] The reader will find abundant material in our work *De corredemptione B. V. Mariae disquisitio positiva*, now being printed at the Vatican.

Fifty Years Ago

In the July, 1900, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* the leading article, by Dom B. Mackey, O.S.B., is entitled "The Ideal Seminary according to St. Francis de Sales." The author explains that, although St. Francis de Sales did not find himself in a position to establish a seminary in the course of his episcopate, we can gather from his writings the norms he would have followed in drawing up rules for such an institution. Concerning the course of studies, as the Saint would have prescribed it, Dom Mackey says: "We know that the day would be full; would begin early rather than close late; that neither professors nor students would be overdriven; that to do well would always be considered rather than to do much; that there would be frequent recapitulation and ascertainment of progress by examinations and debates." . . . Fr. Bernard Feeney, writing on "The Personal Character of the Preacher," develops the idea that the priest who would be an effective preacher must live up to the lessons he teaches. He says: "The influence of preaching is likewise lessened very much, and sometimes wholly destroyed, when it becomes known that the preacher has certain habitual defects which ill assort with the gentle and unselfish character of his sacred calling; such are harshness in exacting pew-rents and stole-money." . . . Continuing his series of articles on "Church Building," Abbé J. Hogan expresses disapproval of the custom followed by some priests of using the church basement almost exclusively for services and for the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament except on Sundays, when the upper church is opened. . . . Among the book reviews appears an account of a book appropriate to Holy Year—*St. Peter in Rome and His Tomb on Vatican Hill*, by Fr. A. Barnes. The book, we are told, contains a substantial introduction to the question of the residence and the martyrdom of St. Peter in Rome.

F. J. C.

THE GOOD SHEPHERD IN PARABLE AND PROPHECY

One of the finest tributes paid a Saint in the liturgical year is that given the martyr Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas à Becket. The Gospel assigned by the Church for his Mass is that of the Good Shepherd, the tenth chapter of St. John's Gospel: "I am the good shepherd and I lay down my life for my sheep."

Christ proposed a high challenge to priests and priests-to-be in setting up Himself as the exemplar of the Good Shepherd in the parables of the Good Shepherd and the Lost Sheep.

Much as the parable of the Good Shepherd means to us already, our appreciation of it can be deeply enriched when we discover the pastoral background presupposed by our Lord in His Palestinian hearers.

Many of his listeners actually were shepherds, or at least had been as boys. And all of them looked back with pride to their pastoral tradition in Scriptural history.

Abel, God's first favored son after the Fall, was a shepherd. The patriarchs all were shepherds—Abraham, Isaac, Jacob. Moses and David, the two greatest glories of Israel and outstanding types of the Messias-to-come, were shepherds.

Moreover, sheep played a prominent part in the sacrificial life of Jewish worship in the Temple. In economic life, all the clothes they wore—other than leather goods—were of wool. Silk and cotton were as yet unknown; flax was a precious Egyptian rarity.

Ewe sheep supplied milk that was prized even above goat's milk, especially for making cheese. Even the very poor usually managed to keep a ewe or two for wool and milk.

Lamb as meat, however, was seldom eaten except on festal occasions or at the Pasch. The Syrian sheep common to Palestine is an oddity that even caught Herodotus' fancy. He may have been exaggerating a bit when he wrote that some of these sheep were outfitted with little carriages ingeniously attached as trailers to support the bulky, fat-laden tails. Jews and Arabs prize this fat as a rare delicacy. Westerners who have sampled it, however, say that it tastes for all the world like so much fried tallow.[1]

[1] Tristram, H. B., *The Natural History of the Bible* (London: The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1868), p. 144.

This by way of introduction to give us a hasty glimpse into the mentality and background of Christ's Jewish auditors.

* * * * *

Christ began: *"Amen, amen, I say to you, he who enters not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbs up another way, is a thief and a robber."* [2]

The Palestinian sheep-stealer is not an adept at lockpicking. He resorts to more primitive methods. The sheepfolds in the open countryside are a low, walled enclosure. The walls are mostly just piled-up rubble with thorn brambles strung along the top. The enclosure is pierced by a single door—locked securely at night.

A shepherd is deputed for the night watch. If he should doze off, as happens often enough in the long watches of the night, thieves may come. One of them steals cautiously over the wall at the opposite end from the sleeping shepherd, having first carefully removed the brambles from the top of the wall. A companion or two keeps a watchful eye on the sleeper, to give the warning if he should awake.

Meanwhile the robber slips up to the sheep and slits the throats of three or four before they can bleat out a warning. Then he hands them over the wall to his accomplices outside and they make off with them.

This kind of stealth is impossible if, as is often the case, a half-dozen dogs are on hand to warn the shepherd. In that event, the robbers may slit the throat of the shepherd. Then they help themselves at leisure.

Our Blessed Lord continues with the parable: *"But he who enters by the door is the shepherd of the sheep. To this man the gatekeeper opens and the sheep hear his voice and he calls his own sheep by name and leads them forth."* [3]

As a rule, Palestinian sheep bands are comparatively small. For example, David had once been sharply rebuked by his oldest brother, Eliab, when the latter discovered David in the Israelite camp before the Philistine host. "Why camest thou hither? And why didst thou leave those few sheep in the desert? I know thy pride . . . thou art come down to see the battle."[4]

Owners of several little sheep bands such as David's might team up together and then take turns with the night watch, singly or in

[2] *John* 10:1. [3] *John* 10:2-3. [4] *I Kings* 17:28.

groups. St. Luke's Christmas story has immortalized this custom. In the morning the one on watch—one of the shepherd-owners or a hireling—would open the locked door to the shepherds as they came for their little flock.

An authority on Palestinian customs, G. R. Lees, was witness to a scene of the separating of a mixed flock, quite similar to that described by our Lord: Lees writes:

> I remember . . . one morning in summer an immense flock of sheep under the care of several shepherds. The sheep had to be separated. First one shepherd and then another called: 'Tahoo, Tahoo.' The sheep lifted up their heads and for a time there was a general scramble, until long lines of sheep extricated from the common flock, slowly followed the retreating footsteps of their respective guides. They knew their shepherd's familiar voice; it had sounded so often in their ears they were familiar with its tone. But on more than one occasion I have used the same cry, 'Tahoo,' but never a sheep would follow me.[5]

Here are our Saviour's own words: *"The sheep hear his voice and he calls his own sheep by name and leads them forth. And when he has let out his own sheep, he goes before them. And the sheep follow him because they know his voice. But a stranger they will not follow, but will flee from him, because they do not know the voice of strangers."* [6]

Christ said He called his sheep *by name*. This is literally true even today in Palestine. The long hours together in desert or mountain solitude develops a deep attachment between sheep and shepherd. The good shepherd has known his lambs from the day they were born when he carried them home in his cloak.

Some peculiarity of feature or deportment marks them out for a special name. Blackie, Tag-a-long, Old Curiosity, Cry-baby, The Gentle One—all these nicknames in their Arabic or Jewish equivalents can still be heard among the Jewish or Bedouin herdsmen.

In Tristram's *Natural History of the Bible* there is striking counterpart of this picture painted by Christ.

> I asked my man if it was usual in Greece to give names to sheep. He informed me that it was, and that the sheep obeyed their shepherd when he called them by their names. This morning I had an opportunity of

---

[5] Lees, G. Robinson, *Village Life in Palestine* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1907), pp. 17 ff.

[6] *John* 10:3-5.

verifying this. Passing by a flock of sheep, I asked the shepherd to call one of his sheep. He did so and it instantly left its pasturage and companions, and ran up to the hand of the shepherd with signs of pleasure, and with a prompt obedience which I had never before observed in other animals. The shepherd told me that many of his sheep are still wild; that they had not yet learned their names, but by teaching them, they would all learn them. Those which knew their names he called *tame*.

If a stranger calls they stop short, lift up their heads in alarm, and if it is repeated they turn and flee, because they know not the voice of a stranger. This is not the fanciful costume of a parable; it is simple fact. I have made the experiment repeatedly.[7]

Our Lord now openly reminds his hearers of the fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecies in Himself: *I am the good shepherd.* In Christ the "Shepherd Psalm" of David finds its fulfillment.

The prophetic and historical glories of the chosen people had been intimately associated with the faithful shepherd and his flock, in contrast to unfaithful shepherds abominated by God.

There is the favorite shepherd Psalm of David, the 22nd: Knox translated it: "The Lord is my shepherd. How can I lack anything: he gives me a resting-place where there is green pasture, leads me out by cool waters, and revives my drooping spirits. By sure paths he leads me, and though I should walk with the shadow of death all around me, I will not be afraid of any harm: thy rod and thy crook are my comfort." [8]

And the Prophet Ezechiel had written: "Thus said the Lord God: I myself will seek my sheep and will visit them. . . . I will feed them in the most fruitful pastures . . . and I will cause them to lie down, saith the Lord God. . . . I will seek that which was lost: and that which was driven away, I will bring again: and I will bind up that which was broken, and I will strengthen that which was weak. . . . AND I WILL SET UP ONE SHEPHERD OVER THEM. and he shall feed them, even my servant David: he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd." [9] This same chapter from Ezechiel becomes all the more striking when juxtaposed with Christ's own

[7] Tristram, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

[8] Knox, Ronald, *The Book of Psalms in Latin and English* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1948), Psalm 22, p. 55.

[9] *Ezech.* 34:11, 14-16, 23.

denunciation of Israel's false leaders. Scriptural commentators agree that the thieves and robbers spoken of in the parable of the Good Shepherd refer to these false teachers.

Here is the opening of the chapter in Ezechiel that ends with the previously cited promise of a messianic good shepherd:

> Son of man, prophesy concerning the shepherds of Israel. . . . Thus saith the Lord God: Woe to the shepherds of Israel that fed themselves: should not the flock be fed by the shepherds? You ate the milk, and you clothed yourselves with the wool, and you killed that which was fat: but my flock you did not feed. The weak you have not strengthened, and that which was sick you have not healed . . . and that which was driven away you have not brought again, neither have you sought that which was lost. . . . And my sheep were scattered because there was no shepherd: and they became the prey of all the beasts of the field. . . . Behold I myself will seek my sheep, and will visit them.[10]

Isaias returns to the Good Shepherd theme in this word-cameo: "He shall feed his flock like a shepherd: He shall gather together the lambs with his arm, and shall take them up in his bosom, and he himself shall carry them that are with young."[11] This very scene described by Isaias can still be seen in Christ's homeland. Tristram in his *Natural History of the Bible* reports that during lambing time and the weeks immediately following, "the shepherd is often laden with the young lambs which are too tender to follow with the rest. I have often seen a shepherd carrying a lamb under each arm and two or three more in the hood of his cloak as he led the flock." [12]

And now Christ points to the ultimate test of the devoted shepherd: *"I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd lays down his life for his sheep. But the hireling, who is not a shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, sees the wolf coming and leaves the sheep and runs away; and the wolf snatches and scatters the sheep: But the hireling flees because he is a hireling and has no concern for the sheep."* [13]

Our Lord contrasts the fidelity of the Good Shepherd toward the flock, with the craven hireling's flight in the face of danger. Hireling shepherds are and were always held in low repute in

[10] *Ezech.* 34:2-4, 5, 11.
[11] *Isaias* 40:11.
[12] Tristram, *op. cit.*, p. 140.
[13] *John* 10:11-13.

Palestine. Their testimony is not admitted into a Jewish law court. Moreover there is a strict code of legal regulations regarding their responsibility for their flocks. If one wolf attacks—they are held responsible for damages; if two wolves—they are excused. If a lion or bear attacks—excused; and so on. The people are warned not to buy wool, milk or a small lamb from a hireling. They might be stolen and have to be restored. Among adages handed down from father to son is one to this effect: "Son, whatever else you become, don't be a camel-driver, a barber or a shepherd!"

Shepherding was even at its best considered fit only for boys. It was the heritage of the youngest son of the family. When he was old enough to do anything better he promptly handed on the job to the next in line. If there were no boys, girls would tend the sheep. Sephora the wife of Moses had been a shepherdess with six of her sisters. And Jacob had met Rachel for the first time when she was watering her flocks at the village well.

Yet some of these boy shepherds had a valiant record for courage and fidelity when the test of the true shepherd came. David, for example, during his shepherding days had been called on at least twice to risk his life for his flock. Once from the attack of a bear and once from a lion. Bears still infest the Lebanon vales. And in recent years a lion was killed not far from Damascus, only sixty air-miles northeast of the Sea of Galilee. These short-maned Asiatic lions were once a real menace in Palestine, especially in the wilderness of the Jordan valley.[14]

David combines the two attacks when he tells the story to Saul as his credentials for accepting Goliath's challenge. The beasts had charged the flocks, seized the biggest ram they could find and made off with the prey. But David the faithful set off at once after the attackers. Getting within range of the beast he struck them with the knot-headed club the shepherd always carries. This is the "rod" of the Psalm's "thy rod and thy crook have comforted me." Here is the terse vivid Scriptural account of the battle: "I pursued after them, and struck them. . . . And they rose up against me, and I caught them by the throat, and I strangled and killed them." And David drives home his point: "The Lord who delivered me

[14] Cf. Tristram, *op. cit.*, p. 170.

out of the paw of the lion, and out of the paw of the bear, he will deliver me out of the hand of this Philistine." [15]

The sling which David later took as his sole weapon against Goliath would be familiar equipment for the modern Palestinian shepherd. It is a home-made affair, braided by the shepherd himself of goat's hair. Shepherds pride themselves on their deadly accuracy with the sling. Against wolves and jackals it is their chief weapon of defense. During the long hours with the sheep, it is both a recreation and serves for a mechanical sheep-dog. Should a ram or lambkin wander off a bit from the flock, a rock is dropped just ahead of him to drive him back with the rest. Strangely the Jew and Bedouin shepherds have no use whatever for sheep-dogs except for use at night around the sheepfold to warn against marauders, whether of the two or four-footed variety.

Christ brings into focus all the warmth and allusion of the shepherd heritage of His audience. Note how he first points out the tender attachment between shepherd and flock; then, he weaves into this context a strong allusion to His Divinity; and finally he predicts His coming Passion and death: *"I am the good shepherd, and I know mine and mine know me, even as the Father knows me and I know the Father: and I lay down my life for my sheep."*[16]

At this point a typical Joannine touch creeps into the parable. St. John was writing with the Gentiles of Ephesus and Patmos in mind. He never passes up an opportunity to bring in something Christ said or did that would be especially encouraging to Gentiles: *"And other sheep I have, that are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd."* [17]

To the Jews this same passage would recall Ezechiel's prophecy: "I will set up one shepherd over thee." [18] And to us, it is a prophecy of the return, some day, of Israel to the one true fold.

THOMAS A. HALLEY, S.J.

St. Mary's College
St. Mary, Kansas

[15] *I Kings* 17:35-37.
[16] *John* 10:14-15.
[17] *John* 10:16.
[18] *Ezech.* 34:23.

THE RELIGIOUS ASSENT DUE TO THE TEACHINGS OF PAPAL ENCYCLICALS

It is perfectly certain theological teaching that the faithful are bound in conscience to give a sincere and truly inward assent to those doctrines which the Holy Father presents to the Church through the medium of his encyclical letters, even when these doctrines are not set forth as infallibly certain statements. In other words, when some truth which has not been authoritatively presented to the kingdom of God on earth except in a papal encyclical, even when that truth is contained in a non-infallible manner in the Holy Father's letter, Catholics are distinctly obliged, under penalty of offending God Himself, not only to refrain from opposition to this doctrine, but also to accept it as their own firm judgment. There is no question about this basic fact.[1]

Indubitably the Roman Pontiff has the right to issue authoritative doctrinal statements which are presented neither as dogmas of divine faith nor as truths of what has been, since the seventeenth century, generally called *fides ecclesiastica*. This divinely given power, which Franzelin ascribes to his "authority of doctrinal providence,"[2] obviously involves the right to demand from the faithful an acceptance of these statements by an assent which is firm and sincere, yet inferior to the assent of divine faith and the assent of the so-called ecclesiastical faith. Dominic Palmieri and Thomas Pègues speak of a morally certain assent which must be accorded to these authentic, yet non-infallible pontifical teachings.[3] Ludwig Lercher describes this internal religious assent as *interpretative condicionatus*.[4] All agree that the faithful are obligated in conscience to give at least this type of assent to any teaching which has

[1] Cf. the article "The Doctrinal Authority of Papal Encyclicals," in *AER*, CXXI, 2, 3 (Aug. and Sept., 1949), 136-50, 210-20.

[2] Cf. Franzelin, *De divina traditione et scriptura*, 3rd edition (Rome: Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, 1882), p. 131.

[3] Cf. Palmieri, *Tractatus de Romano Pontifice cum prolegomeno de ecclesia*, 2nd edition (Prato, Giachetti, 1891), pp. 718 ff.; Pègues, "L'autorité des encycliques pontificales d'après Saint Thomas," in the *Revue Thomiste*, XII (1904), 512-32.

[4] Cf. Lercher, *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae in usum scholarum*, 2nd edition (Innsbruck: Rauch, 1934), I, 519.

been authoritatively presented to the Church solely through the medium of a papal encyclical.

A tremendous and increasingly important amount of religious teaching has been presented to the Church in papal encyclicals, and authoritatively only in these documents, especially during the past half-century. Hence it seems clear that theologians should do everything within their power to describe and explain the assent due to these doctrines as accurately and as adequately as possible. Such a description and explanation manifestly involve answers to two basic questions. First, what one among the existent theological censures would apply to the denial of a teaching which is proposed authoritatively only in a papal encyclical, and which is presented in a non-infallible manner in that document? Second, against which one of the infused virtues does the denial of such a teaching offend? Completely satisfactory responses to these two questions would be of immense benefit to students of sacred theology. Together they would certainly constitute a definite and important advance in theological science.

The present paper intends merely to open the way to what can be a definitely fruitful discussion of these questions by pointing out some of the salient difficulties inherent in the subject-matter and by indicating probable answers. Ultimately acceptable solutions to these problems can manifestly come only through the corporate work of many theologians and only after certain prior questions have been taken into account.

In setting out to answer the question about the theological censure that would apply to the denial of a doctrine which has been presented authoritatively only in an encyclical and which is proposed in a non-infallible manner in this encyclical, we encounter a rather serious difficulty at the very beginning. The early theological explanations of the various doctrinal censures or notes took no direct cognizance of non-infallible teaching emanating from the *ecclesia docens*. They were, as a class, more interested in explaining the various qualifications in terms of the logical nexus between the teachings to which these censures were applied and statements of Catholic dogma. They made no consistent effort to tie these qualifications up with the various ways in which the *ecclesia docens* actually presents its teachings in Our Lord's kingdom on earth. Since by far the majority of theologians who have dealt with this subject

down through the years have chosen to follow that same tendency, the teaching on the theological censures, even as it stands today, is not directly and perfectly geared to the treatise on the Church's Magisterium.

The practice of reproving certain teachings authoritatively but with a qualification less severe than that of heresy has been common in the Catholic Church since the fourteenth century. Thus Pope Clement V, speaking in the name of the fifteenth oecumenical council, that of Vienne, reproved every doctrine or position rashly asserting or insinuating "that the substance of the rational or intellectual soul is not truly and of itself the form of the human body" as something "erroneous and hostile to the truth of the Catholic faith."[5] In the same paragraph, however, it is asserted that a person who holds or defends this position pertinaciously must be considered as a heretic. Thus, as far as the terminology of this document is concerned, the condemned proposition ceases to be merely erroneous and becomes heretical by reason of the pertinacity or obstinacy of the man who puts it forward.

Pope John XXII, in his constitution *Gloriosam ecclesiam,* condemned five statements contained in the teachings of the Fratricelli. Four of these he qualified as errors. A fifth he listed as a blasphemy.[6] The same Pontiff in his constitution *Cum inter nonnullos* qualified another proposition as something which from that time forward would rightly be qualified as erroneous and as heretical.[7] He characterized certain statements of Marsilius of Padua and of John of Jandun as "contrary to the Scripture, hostile to Catholic faith, *haereticos seu haereticales,* and erroneous."[8] Furthermore, in condemning certain theses which had been proposed by Eckhart, Pope John XXII characterized some of them as heretical and others as "ill sounding, temerarious, and suspect of heresy."[9] Pope Urban V stigmatized each of three propositions taken from the teachings of Denis Foullechat as "false, erroneous, and heretical."[10]

Astonishingly enough, the theologians who dealt with the question of doctrinal censures paid comparatively little attention to these fourteenth-century qualifications. They referred rather to the ac-

[5] In Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum (DB),* 16th edition (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1928), n. 481.

[6] *DB,* 485-89.

[7] *DB,* 494.

[8] *DB,* 500.

[9] *DB,* 529.

[10] *DB,* 575-77.

tion of the Council of Constance, and of Pope Martin V in confirming some of the enactments of this synod. The Council, in its eighth session, had condemned forty-five propositions taken from the works of Wycleff, asserting that many of these were manifestly heretical, several others erroneous, and others again scandalous, blasphemous, temerarious, and offensive to pious ears.[11] Later it rejected thirty propositions ascribed to John Hus.[12] Pope Martin V, in his Bull, *Inter cunctas,* demanded from persons suspected of Wycleffite or Hussite tendencies the admission that the statements stigmatized by the Council "are not Catholic, but some of them notoriously heretical, some erroneous, others temerarious and seditious, and others offensive to pious ears."[13]

The Cardinal John de Turrecremata who had himself been present at the deliberations of the Council of Constance formulated the first influential description of the censures on a theological rather than on merely a canonical level. He distinguished seven different kinds of heretical propositions, each one of which was considered as opposed to a definite class of Catholic truth.[14] As distinct from these, he spoke of certain statements which, though not heretical in the absolute sense, were *haeresim sapientes quia haeresi propinquae.*[15] Such statements were conclusions which followed from two premises, the one an heretical proposition in the strict sense of the term, and the other a perfectly certain and evident statement of the natural order.

Turrecremata defined a temerarious assertion (which, incidentally, he explained just after the propositions savoring of heresy and just before those characterized as erroneous) as "a proposition stating as certain something which cannot be effectively demonstrated either by reason or from authority."[16] As an example of a temerarious proposition he gives a declaration that the world is due to end at the end of one hundred and twenty years. He defines an er-

[11] Cf. Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1916), VII, 224 f.; *DB,* 581-625.

[12] Cf. Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.,* 316 ff.; *DB,* 627-56.

[13] *DB,* 661.

[14] Cf. Turrecremata, *Summa de ecclesia,* Lib. IV, par. 2, c. 10 (Venice, 1561), p. 383v.

[15] Cf. *ibid.*

[16] *Ibid.,* c. 11, p. 384r.

roneous proposition merely as one which states something false.[17] All of the other doctrinal censures have reference, according to Turrecremata, to faults which the condemned teachings are likely to bring about in those who accept them or to the damage they do to others. Later writers spoke of censures which denounced certain statements as ambiguous or misleading.

The theologians who followed Turrecremata were inclined to amplify his teachings about the meaning of that doctrinal censure by which a teaching is qualified as erroneous. Melchior Cano held that this censure differed from that of heresy "not as a genus differs from a species, but as one species of error differs from another."[18] He asserted that a proposition was classified as erroneous in the strict sense of the term when it contradicted a Catholic truth of the second order, a doctrine the denial of which involved, not the loss of faith, but damage to the faith. He believed, furthermore, that when the learned and competent Catholics are firmly convinced that a proposition is of faith, but when the Church has not obviously defined this proposition, its contradiction constitutes an error of the type stigmatized by this doctrinal censure.[19]

Francis Suarez developed the teaching about the censure of a proposition as erroneous to the stage at which it exists in most theological textbooks today. Suarez carefully explained Cano's stand on this question, and admitted that Cano had successfully distinguished the censure of error from that of heresy. He believed, however, that Cano's teachings could not serve to show the difference between the qualification of error and the other censures less severe than that of heresy. It was in order to clarify this last distinction that he offered his own solution to the problem. Suarez insisted that an erroneous proposition was one which was opposed to a doctrine which is theologically certain, but which has not the certitude of divine faith itself. Ultimately such a teaching was classified as a conclusion derived from a syllogism composed of one premise accepted on divine faith and one acceptable in the light of human reason.[20] Thus, for all intents and purposes, the proposition

[17] *Ibid.*

[18] Cano, *De locis theologicis*, Lib. 12, c. 9, in the *Opera theologica* (Rome: Forzani, 1900), III, 82.

[19] Cf. *ibid.*, 83.

[20] Cf. Suarez, *Tractatus de fide*, disp. 19, sect. 2, in the *Opus de triplici virtute theologica, fide, spe, et caritate* (Lyons, 1621), p. 302.

which Suarez would censure as erroneous was equivalent to the one which Turrecremata would qualify as savoring of heresy or as nearly heretical.[21]

Cano developed Turrecremata's teaching about temerarious propositions by asserting that such statements were opposed, not directly to the faith, but rather to the rule of ecclesiastical *modestia*. He classed a denial of Our Lady's assumption as a temerarious statement.[22] Suarez, on the other hand, distinguished two different sorts of temerarious pronouncements. The first were those of the type already described by Turrecremata, teachings presented as certain, but lacking any adequate evidence of certitude or of credibility. The second were those statements opposed to the received and common authority of the Fathers and the scholastics.[23] Suarez' treatment of this question was destined to remain classical in the literature of scholastic theology. There have been some developments, but substantially the position of the theologians today is that of the great Spanish Jesuit writer.

In line with these explanations, it is clear that the contradiction of a doctrinal statement contained in a papal encyclical in a non-infallible manner, but asserted authoritatively only in an encyclical, is something which could be qualified with at least the censure of error. Obviously this applies to doctrinal statements alone. There are many encyclicals, primarily commemorative rather than doctrinal in content, in which some of the statements, particularly of merely historical import, are obviously not being imposed authoritatively upon the members of Christ's flock.

Where there are doctrinal statements, as in the case of the social encyclicals, those which dealt with questions of Church and State, and others of an obviously dogmatic character, it is perfectly clear that these statements deal at least with matters connected with the faith, and that the authority by which they are proposed is at least on a par with that of the common consent of the Fathers or of the scholastics. By reason of these very characteristics, all doctrinal statements contained in the encyclicals must be accepted

[21] Cf. Turrecremata, *op. cit.*, c. 10, p. 383v.

[22] Cf. Cano, *op. cit.*, p. 90. It is interesting to note that Suarez *(loc. cit.)*, lists the denial of Our Lady's assumption as an error according to the principles of Cano himself.

[23] Cf. Suarez, *op. cit.*, p. 304.

with a firm and sincere inward assent. For this same reason a denial of such doctrinal propositions may be qualified or censured as at least temerarious.

Objectively the man who teaches or who accepts such a temerarious proposition is morally at fault. It is important to know against what particular virtue or virtues this man offends by this type of activity.

Cano, as we have seen, believed that such conduct was contrary to the rule of ecclesiastical modesty. The *modestia* to which Cano referred seems to be the virtue which St. Thomas classified in his *Summa theologica* as one of the potential parts of the virtue of temperance. This *modestia* disposes a man towards the proper moderation in those matters in which moderation is not encompassed with any special difficulty.[24]

The Carmelites of Salamanca, in their famed *Cursus theologicus,* listed the teaching and the holding of propositions censured or censurable as temerarious as acts of *curiositas,* as offenses against the virtue of *studiositas,* one of the "parts" of *modestia.*[25] The *curiositas* of which the Salmanticences speak consists in a failure to moderate, or properly to direct, man's natural tendency to seek knowledge. St. Thomas teaches that a man who seeks to know truth which lies beyond the range of his own competence can be considered guilty of this infraction.[26] Those who, on their own initiative, presume to question or to contradict a doctrinal statement proposed authoritatively in a papal encyclical, even in cases where the Holy Father does not make a definitive decision, may well be said to be striving for something manifestly beyond their competence. No individual and, for that matter, no group of individuals within the *ecclesia discens* can be said to have the competence to dispute with the visible head of the Church militant on a matter connected with the Church's deposit of divine revelation.

At least in an indirect manner, however, every rejection of an authoritative doctrinal pronouncement contained in a papal encyclical is opposed to the theological virtue of faith itself. That virtue empowers a man to accept with complete certitude and on God's

[24] Cf. II-II, q. 160, a. 1.

[25] Cf. their *Tractatus de fide,* disp. 9, dub. 4, n. 3, in the *Cursus theologicus* (Paris and Brussels, 1879), XI, 436.

[26] Cf. II-II, q. 167, a. 1.

own authority the body of truth which the Church proposes as having been revealed by God as His public communication to mankind. It must be remembered that the Church definitely does not teach this divine message in the capacity of an entity in any way separated from or independent of God Himself. The *ecclesia docens* acts as God's instrument. What the Church teaches is not the Church's message but God's message.

It must be understood, furthermore, that the commission given to and the responsibility incumbent upon the successor of St. Peter must not be considered as limited to the bare presentation of the truths revealed by God and entrusted to His kingdom on earth. The Prince of the Apostles was empowered and commanded to act as a shepherd to Christ's sheep, and to feed His lambs and His sheep. He and his successors are thus obligated to nourish and to protect the faith of their brethren within the Church. The task which God has entrusted to them makes it imperative that they authoritatively discountenance tenets or propositions injurious to faith or morals even on points upon which they have not as yet issued definitive and absolutely irrevocable decisions.

Thus we lay ourselves open to very serious misunderstandings when we fail to appreciate the fact that the teaching of the Church must be taken as a unit. While it remains perfectly true that not every individual authoritative statement issued by the *ecclesia docens* is to be accepted with the assent of divine faith, we must remember that all of the doctrinal activity of the Catholic Church is essentially nothing more or less than the highly complex process of teaching the content of divine public revelation. All of the subsidiary or preparatory authoritative pronouncements of the Holy Father or of the entire *ecclesia docens;* all of the decisions given by the Church's *magisterium* on matters connected with the deposit of revelation rather than with the formal content of that revealed message, must be considered as a contribution to and as a part of the process of teaching and guarding the divine teaching delivered to the Church by the apostles.

When an individual or a group of individuals presume on their own initiative to deny or to ignore the authoritative doctrinal statements of papal encyclicals, they are at least placed in the position of rejecting divinely authorized guidance in the direction of the purity and the well-being of the faith. The fact that some authori-

tative statements of the Church's *magisterium* are frequently said to demand an adherence of "ecclesiastical faith," while others, again, call for merely "a firm, sincere, and inward religious assent," should not blind men to the paramount truth that all such pronouncements enter into the effective carrying out of the Petrine commission to confirm the faith of the brethren.

Thus, to return to our original questions, it would seem that a rejection of a doctrinal statement proposed authoritatively in a pontifical encyclical could be considered censurable as *ad minus temeraria*. Such an unauthorized rejection on the part of individuals or groups of individuals within the Church would violate what Cano termed "the rule of ecclesiastical *modestia*" and would be opposed, indirectly though none the less truly, to the virtue of divine faith, not in such a way as to destroy that virtue, but objectively to constitute an offense against it and to harm it.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON
The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

PRAISE AND THE PREACHER

If the preacher permits himself to be carried away by a desire of praise, his labour and his talent will profit him nothing. For the mind that cannot bear the foolish criticism of the people becomes discouraged and loses zeal for preaching. Hence it is very important to be convinced that praise should be despised. For if a man is not convinced of this, whatever be his talent for oratory, he will not succeed. And if you consider carefully the case of the man who is without that talent, you will find that he needs contempt of praise no less than the other. For if he permits himself to be overcome by the desire of praise, he will be driven to commit many faults. For as he is unable to equal orators of repute, he will not shrink from plotting against them and envying them, and finding fault with them, and doing many other unseemly things. But he will risk everything, were it even the loss of his own soul, to lower the reputation of others to the level of his own.

—Saint John Chrysostom, *On the Priesthood* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1943. Pp. 114-15).

Answers to Questions

ORDER OF SOLEMN EXPOSITION AND HOLY COMMUNION

Question: When the Sacred Host is to be exposed in the monstrance after the Communion of the celebrant at Mass, as at the Mass at the beginning of the Forty Hours' Adoration, should the Host be placed in the monstrance immediately after the Communion of the Chalice or should the celebrant wait until he has returned to the altar after distributing Holy Communion to the people?

Answer: The Sacred Host should be placed in the monstrance immediately after the Communion of the celebrant and before the latter proceeds to distribute Holy Communion. This decision is based on the rubric of the Missal, governing the procedure on Holy Thursday, when it is prescribed that the Host for the Mass of the Pre-Sanctified be arranged in the chalice before Holy Communion is distributed.

HOLY COMMUNION ON HOLY SATURDAY

Question: May Holy Communion be given to a community of cloistered nuns on Holy Saturday morning in their chapel where Mass has not been celebrated that day but only in the neighboring parish church? If this may be done, must the priest who gives Holy Communion in the convent chapel be the same one who officiated at the services in the church?

Answer: The distribution of Holy Communion on Holy Saturday is regulated by Canon 867, § 3, of the *Codex juris.* This law provides that Holy Communion is not to be distributed to the faithful *(nequit fidelibus ministrari)* except during the Mass of Holy Saturday or immediately after the Mass, this distribution being at least morally united with the ceremonies of the Mass *(continuo ac statim ab iis expletis).*

The case contemplated by our enquirer concerns the plight of cloistered nuns who cannot go out from their convent to receive Holy Communion at the Mass in the parish church. The answer to this difficulty involves an *excursus* into the region of moral

theology, a land for which we do not possess a *visa.* However, we diffidently give the opinion that in the instance of cloistered nuns who would otherwise be deprived of Holy Communion on Easter Eve, the distribution of Holy Communion might take place in the convent chapel after the conclusion of the ceremonies of the day in the parish church. Cappello (*De sacr.,* II, 369) has been cited in defense of this practice. If Holy Communion may be given in the convent chapel, under these circumstances, we see no reason to restrict the minister of it to the celebrant of the Mass in the church.

KNEELING DURING A REQUIEM MASS

Question: There seems to be great lack of uniformity in the matter of the posture of the clergy when assisting at Solemn Requiem Mass. Some kneel while others stand, creating a disorderly appearance from the congregation. Is there any rule other than custom which regulates just when they should kneel, stand, or sit down?

Answer: We agree with our questioner that lack of uniformity in manner of assistance of the clergy *in choro* at Requiem Mass is remarkably prevalent. In fact, we think that no ceremony is more carelessly and inaccurately performed than the funeral ritual. The posture of the clergy in the sanctuary is not left to custom but it is minutely determined by the rubrics of the Missal (*Rub. gen.,* XVII).

At a Requiem Mass, the clergy assisting kneel and rise and stand as at any other Solemn Mass, with the following exceptions:

They kneel, instead of standing, at the singing of the Collect, or Collects.

They kneel, as usual, after the celebrant has recited the *Sanctus* with the ministers but remain kneeling until the *Pax Domini* has been sung, whereas at other Solemn Masses they rise after the elevation of the Chalice.

As at the Collects, so at the Postcommunion, the clergy kneel, rising at the end of the last Postcommunion, not remaining on their knees, as is often incorrectly done, until after the deacon's *Requiescant in pace.*

The clergy should stand during the Absolution following the

Requiem Mass, in conformity with the prescription of the rubric of the Ritual (Tit. VI, Cap. iii, 7).

HOLDING THE BOOK AT THE ABSOLUTION

Question: While a very common practice is for the celebrant himself to hold the book from which he reads the prayers of the Absolution after a Requiem Mass, it is probably more correct that someone hold the book open for him. Should this be done by the deacon or by an altar boy? Some think that only a bishop has the right to a book-bearer.

Answer: First of all, let us observe that the celebrant *in casu* should not hold the book himself since the prayers are to be said by him *junctis manibus,* according to the rubric of the Ritual (VI, iii, 7). The Ritual directs the deacon to hold the book for the celebrant to read the *Non intres* and the prayers following it. The Missal, however (*Rit. Serv.,* XIII, 4), directs that this service be performed by a minor minister. *In praxi,* therefore, either the deacon or an altar boy may hold the book.

As to the restriction of book-bearers to bishops, we need only remember that it is the subdeacon, a cleric in sacred orders, who holds the book from which the deacon chants the Gospel.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

HOLY COMMUNION AT MIDNIGHT

Question: Some pastors of this diocese wish to introduce the practice of a Holy Hour on the eve of the first Friday of each month between 11 and 12 p.m., with Holy Communion immediately after midnight. The argument adduced in favor of this practice is that some men can and will attend at this hour who, because of their occupations, could not receive Holy Communion at the regular time in the morning. May the practice be allowed for this reason? If so, how many hours of eucharistic fast would be required?

Answer: According to the Code: "Holy Communion may be distributed only in those hours in which the sacrifice of the Mass

may be offered, unless a reasonable cause suggests otherwise" (Canon 867, § 4). The time in which Mass may be offered begins one hour before dawn and lasts until one hour after noon (Canon 821, § 1). Hence, the problem proposed by our correspondent resolves itself into the question whether or not there is sufficient reason for the exception which the pastors wish to introduce.

Commenting on the Church's legislation on this matter, a recent writer states:

> The law is less strict for the distribution of Holy Communion than for the celebration of Mass, for the canon permits exceptions to the general law for any reasonable cause. . . . Canon Durieux remarks that a reasonable cause would be found in physical or moral impossibility, a contemplated journey, greater inconvenience, etc.; but that the further removed the Communion is from the normal time, the more important should be the excuse, v.g., if it is a question of giving Communion in the evening or during the course of the night (J. N. Stadler, *Frequent Holy Communion* [Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D. C., 1947], p. 90).

Applying these principles to the case in hand, I am of the opinion that there is not sufficient reason in a normal parish to give Holy Communion to a group of the parishioners shortly after midnight every first Friday, even though some of them could not receive at the regular time and the custom proposed would secure a large attendance at the beautiful devotion of the Holy Hour. For, undoubtedly the majority of those who would avail themselves of this opportunity could receive Holy Communion at the proper time in connection with Mass—the due liturgical setting—so that for these there would be no reasonable cause to justify the exception. Moreover, even those who could not otherwise receive Holy Communion on the first Friday could doubtless approach the holy table some other day of the week, especially Sunday—at least the majority could do so. It should be noted, too, that there is question, not of an isolated case, but of the introduction of a custom intended to be regular and lasting; and this would require a much graver reason than if a priest wished to give Holy Communion at this unusual hour in one instance only. Finally, it should be noted that the full measure of the exception would be employed, since the Blessed Sacrament would be conferred immediately after midnight, and this would call for a graver reason than if it took place at three

or four o'clock in the morning. In view of all these circumstances, I believe that there is not sufficient justification for the introduction of the custom which the questioner describes.

As to the other question, the eucharistic fast binds only from midnight even when a person receives Holy Communion shortly after that hour. But it is most fitting that one should abstain from all food and drink for at least two or three hours before receiving the Blessed Sacrament.

PARISH DANCES

Question: Has there been any relaxation of the decrees of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation, issued in 1916 and 1917, forbidding priests to promote dances and to assist at them?

Answer: The two decrees to which the questioner refers were issued on March 31, 1916, and Dec. 10, 1917, respectively (Cf. *AER*, LV, 1 [July, 1916], 69; and LVIII, 5 [May, 1918], 537). They forbade clerics, whether secular or religious, to promote and assist *(promoveant et foveant)* dances, even those directed toward raising funds for pious purposes, and also to be present at dances, even though they are promoted by members of the laity. As far as I know, there has been no official mitigation of these decrees—at least, none that has been made publicly.

It should be noted, however, that lay persons are not forbidden to arrange dances; and, according to an opinion expressed in the pages of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* (LV, 2 [August, 1916], 194) shortly after the promulgation of the first decree, a priest would not be forbidden to allow the use of the parish hall for this purpose. However, he himself should not be present at the dance.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

PRIVATE PROPERTY AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The temporal goods which God grants us, are ours as to the ownership, but as to the use of them, they belong not to us alone but also to such others as we are able to help out of what we have over and above our needs.

—St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologica*, II-II, q. 32, a. 5, ad 2.

Analecta

The March number of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* contains the allocution which was intended for the delegates to the International Convention of the Catholic Press. It is dated Feb. 17, 1950,[1] but according to the press reports at the time our Holy Father was prevented by an indisposition from delivering it in person, permitting instead its publication in *L'Osservatore romano*. The theme of the allocution was the role of the Press in the education of public opinion, not as a dictator or a regimenter, but as a useful servant of truth, justice, and peace. The public opinion which the Press is called upon to serve was described by our Holy Father as the natural echo, the more or less spontaneous social resonance of environment in the spirit and in the judgment of men. Considered thus as an element of normal social living, its absence or its inarticulateness must be considered as a disease of social life. And any attempt to smother public opinion or to interfere with its liberty must be regarded as an attack on the natural rights of man, as a violation of the order which God has established in the world. The allocution lamented the burden placed on the consciences of publishers in places where only the opinion of the party in power can be tolerated, and averred that the disappointment of his hopes for the amelioration of that situation had been as bitter as their own.

However, a situation at least equally deplorable is that in which public opinion does not express itself because of the lack of interior resources that are prerequisite. It is the sorry result of gigantic organizations of the masses that those who are swallowed up in their complexities are deprived of their power of spontaneous thinking and reduced to an unprotesting uniformity of thought and judgment. Where today can be found that true independence that makes for a spontaneous public opinion? Where are the men of sufficient individuality of personality to create an interior life in society through the light of the central principles of living and of their own strong convictions?

But the complexities or the newness of events, as well as preconceived notions on the part of the public, demand the intervention of the Press in an educative role. This delicate role presupposes

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XLII (1950), 251.

competence, wide training especially in philosophy and theology, an appealing style, and psychological tact. But above all character is indispensable. Character, viewed in its simplest aspect, involves a profound love and an unchangeable respect for the divine order embracing and animating every sphere of life, qualities that the Catholic journalist must feel first in his own heart and then nourish in the hearts of his readers.

If he possesses this character, the Catholic journalist will be on guard against both a mute servility and an uncontrolled spirit of criticism. He will aid in the formation of a Catholic opinion in the Church that will avoid the two dangerous extremes of illusory spiritualism and of materialistic realism, excesses that must be avoided, especially in relation to the social question and to the problem of peace.

Before concluding the address, our Holy Father paid tribute to the spiritual activity of the men of the Catholic press whose labors in the past should be an encouragement to the publishers confronted with the demands of the present. In the confidence that they would rise to these responsibilities, he conferred on them his Apostolic Blessing.

On Jan. 25, 1950,[2] our Holy Father addressed an exhortation to the Hierarchy of Italy in regard to Catholic Action. While expressing his satisfaction with the development of Catholic Action, he explained that he was concerned that it should fulfill the highest hopes entertained in regard to its usefulness. He regarded it as incumbent on his Apostolic ministry to invite the clergy with paternal insistence to establish in every parish the four associations of Italian Catholic Action: the Union of Young Men, the Union of Young Women, the Union of Men, and the Union of Women. To this desire he added the further request that there be established in every diocese the University Associations and the two Movements of Doctors and of Masters. The smallness of the parish should offer no excuse, since number is not the determining element in the work of the Church; even a very few associates in a small parish, animated with the proper spirit, can make a beneficent contribution to the harmonious co-operation of all Catholic influences. A word of exhortation was also addressed to the laity, urging them, in view of the confidence reposed by the Church in the value of

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 247.

their co-operation, to be prompt to place their spiritual energies at the service of their religious leaders. The exhortation was concluded with the Apostolic Blessing bestowed on the Hierarchy, the clergy, the Directors and the members of Catholic Action, and all the faithful committed to the Hierarchy's care.

On Ash Wednesday[3] our Holy Father addressed a radio message to the school children in parochial schools in the United States, asking their charitable assistance in behalf of the poor children of other countries. He reminded them that in the past they had made their modest offerings of food and clothing to enable him to assist their less fortunate brothers and sisters in other lands, offerings which had also helped to keep the latter safe from temptations which would have confronted them had they been obliged to spend their days and perhaps nights with bad companions in the streets. In view of the fact that the Holy Year was a time of special penance, he hoped that their sacrifices would be even more generous this year than in the past.

Public prayers to be offered on Passion Sunday for the improvement of morals and the establishment of peace were ordered in an encyclical epistle dated March 12, 1950.[4] Our Holy Father indicated that he was moved to do this by the threat of war inherent in the armament race that has once more begun, a race that can easily be traced to the dominant place held by systematic lying, to the contempt shown religion, to public and private lack of piety, to the corruption of youth through obscene and irreligious publications, to the deception of the masses, and to the malignant policy which perpetuates hatreds, discord, and violence. He manifested his intention of going to the Basilica of St. Peter on that day and of leading the Catholics of the whole world in prayer and he expressed the confident hope that all bishops would exhort the faithful to join him in that act and in the intentions for which he prayed.

Apostolic Letters were issued on Feb. 19, 1950,[5] placing among the Blessed, the Venerable Servant of God, Vincenza Maria Lopez Vicuna, an action for which the way was prepared by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites of Jan 12, 1950,[6] declaring that all was in readiness for it. A similar decree of the same date[7] prepared the way for the Apostolic Letters of March 5, 1950,[8] beatify-

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 257.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 217.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 237.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 264.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 266.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 242.

ing the Venerable Servant of God, Dominic Savio. Similar decrees were issued by the Sacred Congregation on Dec. 11, 1949, for the beatification of the Venerable Servants of God, Maria Desolata Torres Acosta[9] and Paula Elisabeth Cerioli.[10] On Jan. 12, 1950, the Sacred Congregation of Rites issued decrees accepting the required miracles for the canonization of Blessed Antonio M. Claret[11] and Blessed Marie Emilie de Rodat.[12]

A decree of the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, dated March 15, 1950,[13] condemned the book *Abscôndita, diário da Irma Inês,* compiled by M. da S. Mourão de Freitas, Porto, 1949. The decree placed the book on the Index.

A decree of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation, dated Nov. 26, 1949,[14] transferred from the Diocese of Sarzana to the Diocese of Spezia the towns of Pianezze and Termo of La Spezia.

Apostolic Letters of Oct. 13, 1949,[15] constituted as the principal Patroness of the Association of Italian Cyclists the Blessed Virgin under the title of "Del Ghisallo."

The March number of the *Acta* also publishes the Apostolic Letters of June 12, 1948,[16] establishing an Internunciature in India, and the Decretal Letters of June 12, 1949,[17] raising Blessed Maria Joseph Rosello to the honors of sainthood.

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 261.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 262.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 268.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 270.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 259.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 259.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 236.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 235.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 222.

CATHOLIC EDUCATION AND CITIZENSHIP

Let it be loudly proclaimed and well understood and recognized by all, that Catholics, no matter what their nationality, in agitating for Catholic schools for their children, are not mixing in party politics, but are engaged in a religious enterprise demanded by conscience. They do not intend to separate their children either from the body of the nation or its spirit, but to educate them in a perfect manner, most conducive to the prosperity of the nation. Indeed a good Catholic, precisely because of his Catholic principles, makes the better citizen, attached to his country, and loyally submissive to constituted civil authority in every legitimate form of government.

—Pope Pius XI, in his Encyclical Letter on the Christian Education of Youth, given Dec. 31, 1929 (N.C.W.C. edition, p. 32).

Book Reviews

THE CARDINAL. By Henry Morton Robinson. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1950. Clothbound, pp. 580—$3.50; paperbound, pp. 520—$1.00.

The appearance of a review of a novel in this periodical should call for some sort of explanation. Only occasionally as in the case of *The Keys of the Kingdom* does the editor consider one of sufficient interest to his priestly audience to let it out for appraisal. When a book is so concerned with the inner workings of the Church as well as of the priesthood as the present item little excuse need be made for examining it. This well known best-seller became known to many for the first time in *Cosmopolitan* magazine where a goodly percentage of it was formerly printed. At that time the blurbs of the publicity campaign said that the author, a Catholic layman of Woodstock, New York, had thought of the priesthood as an ex-gob of World War I, and so he went to Columbia University to study Latin and philosophy! Since then Mr. Robinson has said he was never inclined to the priestly state. On that same occasion he further elucidated the background of the novel by stating for public consumption that the character of Lawrence Cardinal Glennon of Boston was based on the the late Cardinal O'Connell but his hero Father Fermoyle was not inspired by Cardinal Spellman since he has never met him. He did not say whether he ever met Cardinal O'Connell (New York *Herald Tribune*, Book Reviews, April 16, 1950). It would be difficult to deny a parallel between Cardinal Spellman's translating an Italian spiritual work written by an old professor in Rome, and the similar incident in the novel. Again, the hero of the work is given the task of flying the Papal statement against Mussolini (*Non abbiamo bisogno)* out of Rome, while in real history that was the task of the present Archbishop of New York. Nonetheless the author's foreword, the existence of which is a kind of sign that he anticipated discussion, insists that the work is "a purely fictional tale."

When a man writes a novel ordinarily it should be reviewed as a novel—that is, a fictional narrative aiming to present a picture of real life in a specific historical period and society. One presumes the characters, the speech used and surroundings portrayed will be believable. It is on this test that *The Cardinal* fails as a novel in the eyes of this reviewer. Stephen Fermoyle (some suspicious clerical minds have seen something in the inversion of the initials, F. J. S., which the author would not admit) rises in Horatio Alger fashion as a son of simple Medford, Massachusetts, people through several curateships to serve as

secretary to the Cardinal Archbishop of Boston, then to the Vatican Secretariat of State, back again to the United States as an assistant at the Apostolic Delegation in Washington, D. C. (while getting his Ph.D. at The Catholic University of America!) and then to become Bishop of "Hartfield" and in 1939 a Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church. Even then Cardinal Fermoyle elicits the hintful remark of his old Cardinal mentor that his rise is not yet finished. Weaving in and out and around this story of an ecclesiastical career are many minor characters, all of which the author scrupulously disposes of before the end. The Lanny Budd twists in the Fermoyle super-competent contacts with important world figures in the late part of his career have been frequently noted but the Frank Merriwell aspects are also worthy of attention. The climb into a sewer pipe ("sine pantibus" for some strange reason) or up the fire ladder a few minutes before the collapse of a burning building to administer the last rites were highly improbable performances in one man's life—not to mention several bouts on Horace with Cardinal Merry del Val and a flogging by the K.K.K.! The hero may be, as the author says in his foreword, a composite of all the priests he ever knew, but the mixture also includes a few priests that no one ever knew.

Despite passages, especially in the early part of the book, that comprise good attention-holding story telling, on the whole it is a series of flashes of a triumphal career. Stephen Fermoyle could reorganize a hopelessly involved orphan establishment in two weeks, find himself spiritually by an impulsive swim in a lily pond at the end of the trolley line, administer a diocese from a sick bed for many months, escape an Italian countess—once when her game is called on account of rain and again by the sudden death of a close friend and a month of prayer and hard work in a monastery. Obviously Fermoyle was not one to do things by halfway measures. His family share somewhat less in these talents, but in other ways constitute a more fabulous collection of characters than could be brought together from thirty priests' families.

Priests may be interested in a few items which may be classified as "howlers" in this quasi-historical novel. These escaped the eye of what from the general knowledge portrayed, must have been some kind of clerical collaborator. One wonders about how even Roman students (whom the author has sitting under professors at the North American College) worked on the non-extant Aramaic originals of the New Testament, or who translated "lumbis" as if it were "visceribus" for the author. The "mystery of the transubstantiation" radiating in the lives of men has a peculiar ring to a Catholic ear. The priest friend of the hero is hard to believe even by attributing his nervousness about sex to a delayed adolescence, for his ignorance would not be found in any one who had gone through a seminary nor his boyish conversation in

any American priest. Stephen has a difficult time with a wayward sister in a tangential plot which rounds out the volume for the readers of the slick magazines. His regrets about the wisdom of his very proper explanation of her obligation again makes him a little less believable priest. Some things will be news even to the clergy such as "deanery funds," the archbishop's "Congregation for Archdiocesan Affairs," as well as cathedral chapters in the United States or the bishops ability under Canon Law to unify diocesan funds by monthly collections from the incomes of the parishes.

The story of *The Cardinal* seems to be an attempt to work into fictional form almost every major problem faced by the Church in the United States in the last four decades. When the author presents the Catholic teaching or position he usually does so accurately and even reverently. One might question, however, his latitudinarianism in using the word, "sect," to include the Church, his way of speaking about the honor due to our neighbor's erroneous religious beliefs rather than the neighbor himself, or having an Italian theologian bracket Mormon Joseph Smith with Saints Augustine and Theresa. Certainly his insight into the use of the confessional suggests Rabbi Liebmann rather than approved Catholic practice. The monkly psychoanalysis of Father Fermoyle, moreover, is about as convincing in its fashion as the usual movie perversion of that process. The past years are all reflected in questions ranging from craniotomy, the 1928 election, inter-faith co-operation, fascism, the K.K.K.—just name it, and this novel has it.

Some readers may be impressed by the author's picture of the Church's organization at work. It too is of course, "super." The omnipresent pinpointed maps on the chancery walls are symbolic of it. Others may wonder about the human element in the Church a little more than they had previously. Many priests in the United States have probably discovered their people to be enjoying this story which seems to be giving them the "inside" on what they have such devotion to, but still no intimate knowledge of, namely their priesthood and the government of the Church. We may hope they will remember the book is a novel in which the resemblance to real people for the most part is purely accidental.

Canon Sheehan years ago in this *Review* caught a much more real though novelized picture of the priesthood than *The Cardinal* has. In our own day John Powers does it more effectively in a short story than Robinson has in his panoramic novel. Neither of these writers would ever have utilized some of this overdone surface scene (*Variety* would call it "schmalz") but they would have gone much deeper.

HENRY J. BROWNE